

AU/ACSC/0601I/97-03

EAST-WEST "GIANTS" ON COLLISION COURSE:
UNDERLYING CAUSES FOR FUTURE US-CHINA
CONFLICT

A Research Paper

Presented To

The Research Department
Air Command and Staff College

In Partial Fulfillment of the Graduation Requirements of ACSC

by

Major Michael J. Wallace

March 1997

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A
Approved for Public Release
Distribution Unlimited

20020115 050

Disclaimer

The views expressed in this academic research paper are those of the author(s) and do not reflect the official policy or position of the US government or the Department of Defense.

Contents

	<i>Page</i>
DISCLAIMER	ii
LIST OF TABLES	v
PREFACE	vi
ABSTRACT	viii
US/CHINA RELATIONS “DOWNWARD SPIRAL”.....	1
Introduction	1
Overview of the Current Trend and Assumptions	2
Summing Up	5
APPLYING DOYLE AND HUNTINGTON TO THE CAULDRON	7
Introduction	7
Doyle’s Theory: Liberal US Policy Implications With A Non-Liberal China.....	8
Huntington’s Theories: Clash Between Two Civilizations and Cultural Backlash	15
Summing Up	23
CASE STUDY ANALYSIS: TIANANMEN SQUARE IMPACT	29
Introduction	29
Overview of the Mass Demonstrations in Apr-Jun 1989	30
Tiananmen-Related China/US Misperceptions and Miscommunications	33
The Mobius Strip: Future Implications of Current US Policy and Post-Deng China ...	39
Summing Up	44
THREE FUTURE US/CHINA CONFLICTS?.....	49
Introduction	49
Year 2004: Defense of the Homeland: Suppression of Hong Kong Democracy.....	50
Year 2008: Final Chinese Unification: The Forceful Incorporation of Taiwan	53
Year 2012: The Dragon Flies: China’s “Encirclement” Breakout	56
Conclusions/Recommendations	59
APPENDIX A: NATIONAL SECURITY STRATEGY’S EAST ASIAN AND THE PACIFIC REGIONAL STRATEGY, FEBRUARY 1996 (REPRINTED VERBATIM).63	
APPENDIX B: CHRONOLOGY OF THE CHINESE NATION-STATE.....	69
Introduction	69
Synopsis.....	69

Chronology:.....	70
APPENDIX C: CHRONOLOGY OF TIANANMEN SQUARE CASE STUDY	77
Introduction	77
GLOSSARY.....	88
BIBLIOGRAPHY	90

Tables

	<i>Page</i>
Table 1. US-China Selected Comparisons (As of 1995).....	3
Table 2. Recent and planned Major Naval and Air Acquisitions.....	39

Preface

The “combative” nature of this century, including two world wars, highlights the need to better understand why nations fight. The international system and associated states are in a dynamic period of transition as a result of the conclusion of the Cold War. The emerging world security environment, combined with shrinking defense budgets, demands that US military professionals keep current on world affairs potentially threatening our national security through the advent of war. This is necessary to ensure armed forces are properly trained in employing the most effective means of operating with regard to the “emerging causes of war.”

One such area, China-US relationship, stands out as an important linkage in the evolving world order and a potential source of conflict. Properly addressed, the US policy of engagement and enlargement can help bring about stability and lasting peace in this increasingly important region of the world. Failure can lead “down the slippery slope to war” as the underlying sources of conflict erupt into hostilities. One can not definitely end the prospect of war; however, proactive planning and understanding of other states, their vital national issues, and their core cultural values can lessen its possibility. If war does occur, this planning and understanding can be translated into the development and implementation of a conflict termination strategy that establishes a more stable environment and lasting state of peace.

This project offers a concise perspective into the evolving relationship between China and the US as the international environment state of flux smoothes out into its next configuration. Three plausible conflict scenarios and some conclusions and recommendations are presented to improve understanding of this evolving relationship and offer a vehicle for continued debate and research in this important area to military and diplomatic professionals.

I greatly appreciate the assistance and understanding provided by my faculty research advisor, Lt Col Jim Forsyth, who kept me on course and challenged me to produce a meaningful and useful product. His elective course greatly helped to expand my horizons and vision regarding the causes of war as this paper was developed. Two course books, *The Causes of War* by Blainey and *History of the Peloponnesian War* by Thucydides, in particular figured prominently to furthering my general understanding and focusing my research efforts. My heartfelt thanks go to my brother who encouraged me greatly during this project though he was undergoing his own ultimate battle. Finally, I owe my dear and long time Hong Kong friend, Maria Angelia Rono, many thanks for the unique insights she provided as this product was developed and refined. She was also very helpful in aiding my research by providing me valuable opportunity to access the thoughts of others close to China and its ways. Their collective insights and support were an integral part of this product of significance and usefulness to the military and diplomatic communities.

Abstract

The concept of a non-liberal China continuing to grow anywhere near its current rates economically and militarily is viewed with a mixture of reactions: from fear to acceptance, to skepticism and cynicism, and an outright desire to stop it from happening. With about 21% of the world's population, China has the potential to exert a tremendous influence in the international scene as the state of flux recedes and the next world order emerges. The Pacific Rim continues to grow in importance to the United States, as delineated in the most recent National Security Strategy. Understanding the political, cultural, and warfare philosophy of China will aid immeasurably to charting the future course to take in the relations assuming China continues to rise in power. A suitable framework, furnished by relevant theories fashioned in light of the dynamic and complex world, is necessary to facilitate the navigation through the underlying sources of conflict.

Two modern-day theorists, Doyle and Huntington, have significantly contributed to differing aspects that are worth considering in regard to potential conflict between the US and China over miscommunications and misperceptions. Doyle looks at the inherent tensions between powerful liberal and non-liberal states. Many missed opportunities to pursue mutual advancement of strategic interests and a general reduction in tensions through accommodation is evident. This leads to increased probability of conflict at the expense of peace rather than resolve underlying causes of conflict proactively. Huntington clearly delineates the inherent dangers of the interactions between two civilizations that

can lead to conflict. He also outlines the dangerous path the West is pursuing in advancing its culture throughout the world. Conflict could come through a blast of cultural backlash when the “right spark” ignites the equivalent of oil on water mixture.

This research paper analyzes selected historic and projected trends of China relevant to its troubled relationship with the US, applies the theories of Doyle and Huntington to focus and support the argument, and conducts an analysis of US/China relationship against the backdrop of the Tiananmen Square tragedy. This project concludes with three potential future alternatives where certain underlying causes of war lead to hostilities between the US and China along with some closing conclusions and recommendations to minimize their happenstance. These potential scenarios underscore the importance of exploring “the causes of war” in the context of an evolving world order in order to achieve national security objectives short of war. Against the possibility of military hostilities, these ideals can be used to focus contingency planning, enhance the realism of military training, and improve the development and implementation of a conflict termination strategy to establish a more stable environment and lasting state of peace.

Chapter 1 provides an overview of US/China relations along with four assumptions. Chapter 2 establishes a framework, using the theories of Doyle and Huntington, regarding potential misunderstandings and conflict in the US/China relationship. Chapter 3 uses a case study to highlight certain embedded “sparking points” through miscommunications and misperceptions as well as potential ones elevated by current US policy as China continues its assumed growth towards being a “Great Power.” Finally, Chapter 4

concludes with three alternative futures of US/China conflict with some conclusions and recommendations to decrease their probability of occurrence.

Chapter 1

US/China Relations “Downward Spiral”

Taking the long view, we simply cannot afford to leave China forever outside the family of nations, there to nurture its fantasies, cherish its hates and threaten its neighbors. There is no place on this small planet for a billion of its potentially most able people to live in angry isolation.

—Nixon, 1967

We will never seek hegemony nor will we allow another to do so.

—Mao, 1969

Introduction

The United States of America and the People’s Republic of China (PRC) are seemingly headed closer to a collision as each new year pass. The alliance of necessity to prevent Soviet dominance of Asia has steadily eroded over the last decade into a rivalry marked by increasingly tense conflict. Another cycle of tougher and more dangerous times appears to be emerging as China, with over 21% of the world’s population, seems to be growing bolder with its increasing economic and military power while the United States (US) continues to flounder in applying a consistent and pragmatic policy towards the PRC. If China remains aggressive and the US inconsistent, conflict leading to military hostilities appears to loom ahead.

Overview of the Current Trend and Assumptions

The propositions in this paper are based on four reasonable assumptions. First, the US remains committed to some similar variant of its current national security strategy for the region. Second, China is striving to resume its historical status as a “Great Power” in the region. Third, the US remains a strong liberal state while China completes its transition to becoming a powerful non-liberal state. Fourth, future circumstances in the region evolve in a sensible and consistent manner suitable to setting up potential confrontational situations lacking only the “right spark.”

The United States, leader of the West, proudly stands as the lone superpower, with the recent demise of the Soviet Union, in today’s international system. Reflecting her sense of pride and power, the US has adopted a policy of engagement and enlargement that serves as the basis for the first assumption. As embodied in the National Security Strategy (NSS), President Clinton wrote, “I am committed to forging a new public to sustain our active engagement abroad in pursuit of our cherished goal—a **more secure world where democracy and free markets know no border** (emphasis added).”¹ Within its covers, East Asia is noted as a region of growing importance for US security and prosperity. The NSS regional approach for East Asia has been included verbatim as Appendix A for reference. The three US pillars for East Asia are enhancing security, encouraging economic prosperity, and supporting democratic reform in the region. Of particular interest, this approach lays out the requirement for an open and stable China respecting the rights and interests of its people as well as an active US leadership role in the region to secure our own interests and deter aggression.² Table 1 provides a

comparison of pertinent factors to aid visualization of what the US is trying to accomplish in regard to a rising China within the East Asia region.

Table 1. US-China Selected Comparisons (As of 1995)

Indicator	US	China
Population (in millions)	264	1203
Urban population (%)	76	767676
Land Area (in thousands)	3615	3707
GNP (in billions)	6833	3200
Troops (in thousands)	1500	3000
Tanks	12500	9400
Combat Aircraft	4971	5224
Naval Vessels	237	110
Nuclear Warheads	6000	300+

SOURCE: Kuchment, Anna, *Charting the Deng Revolution*, Newsweek, 3 Mar 97, 26-27.

In regard to the second assumption, China's current dynasty, the Communists, is on the rise. The economy has been growing at nearly double digit rate since 1980³ and military spending has been increasing at nearly 14% since Tiananmen Square in 1989.⁴ Within a decade at these rates, China is set to be the largest economy in the world with a credible military power tailored specifically to the region and its apparent national political goals. China is an ambitious and unsatisfied growing power that historically desires sufficient domination of East Asia so that nothing happens without at least tacit Chinese consent. Excepting Taiwan (a rebellious province in China's eyes), Communist China does not appear to be inclined to invade and conquer neighboring nations. China may quite possibly initiate limited wars to achieve important objectives, as evidenced by the ones with India in 1962 and Vietnam in 1978.⁵ Appendix B, containing a synopsis and chronology of China's significant cultural, political and warfare history and characteristics, is insightful. The first two assumptions allow the fluctuating world order be brought into

focus to reasonably discuss the ramifications of underlying sources of conflict between the US and China.

The third assumption, in tandem with the first two, provides realistic but necessary boundary conditions to selectively apply theories espoused by Doyle and Huntington. Doyle looks at the inherent tensions between powerful liberal and non-liberal states. Many missed opportunities to pursue mutual advancement of strategic interests and general reduction in tensions through accommodation is evident. This leads to increased probability of conflict at the expense of peace rather than resolve underlying causes of conflict proactively.⁶ Huntington clearly delineates the inherent dangers of the interactions between two civilizations that can lead to conflict.⁷ He also outlines the dangerous path the West is pursuing in advancing its culture throughout the world.⁸ Conflict could come through cultural backlash when the “right spark” ignites the equivalent of oil on water mixture.

The last assumption is partially taken care of by a case study against the backdrop of the mass movement at Tiananmen Square in 1989. It provides coverage of selected parameters of the US-PRC relationship related to appropriate sources of conflict. A chronological account, consisting of several distinct phases related to the tragedy of Tiananmen Square, is located under Appendix C. The “snapshot” analysis of the Tiananmen Square case, coupled with selective application of the theories of Doyle and Huntington, provides the foundation for analyzing pertinent underlying sources of conflict and related trends. This paper concludes with three potential future alternatives where miscommunications and misperceptions, in unison with suitable regional circumstances,

lead to conflict between the US and China along with some closing conclusions and recommendations to minimize their happenstance.

Summing Up

This chapter provides an overview of US/China relations along with four rational assumptions to analyze underlying sources of conflict between the US and China. The first two assumptions are reasonable for the emerging new world order in the post-Cold War era and are sensible but necessary conditions for the remainder of the paper. The third assumption, selectively applying theories espoused by Doyle and Huntington, examines potential conflicts and misperceptions between the US and China in the next chapter. The fourth assumption, potential US/China confrontational situations happening, is dealt with in the last two chapters. Chapter 3 uses a case study of Tiananmen Square to highlight certain embedded “sparking points” through miscommunications and misperceptions as well as potential ones arising from current US policy as China continues its assumed intact growth towards becoming a “Great Power” once again. Finally, Chapter 4 concludes with three alternative futures for violent US/China hostilities with some conclusions and recommendations to decrease their probability of occurrence.

Notes

¹ The White House, *A National Security Strategy of Engagement and Enlargement* (Washington DC, US GPO, 1996), iv. One could argue the current US national strategy is the third wave of foreign policy premises laid out by Woodrow Wilson. The imperatives of this type of foreign policy are collective security, conversion of competitors to the American way (i.e., democracy), a fair and equitable international system and unqualified support for ethnic self-determination. The first two waves took place after WWI and WWII while this one is coming off the end of the Cold War. See Kissinger, Henry, *Diplomacy*, New York: Touchstone, 1995.

² Ibid., 39-41.

Notes

³ Institute for National Strategic Studies, *Strategic Assessment 1996* (Washington DC, United States Government Printing Office, 1996), 50. The Strategic Analysis books are written yearly with a strong focus on US interests and assess various options on key national security issues in some depth. It is the product of a group of scholars acting as independent analysts though some do work for university's funded by the US government.

⁴ Bernstein, Richard, *The Coming Conflict With China* (New York: Alfred Knopf, 1997), 70. RAND in Project Air Force, Strategic Appraisal 1996 also shows similar increases: 1989 & 1990 at 15%; 1991, 1992, 1993 at 14%; and 1994 at 23%. This book was written by two prior China correspondents and Asian bureau chiefs. It covers the high-stake clashes of competing ideologies and economic interests of the US and China. They show China's shifting perceptions of America in terms of its might and as an enemy. They are asserted to being global rivals with far more dangerous times ahead.

⁵ Christenson, Thomas, *Chinese Realpolitik*, Foreign Affairs, Vol. 75 No 5 (Sep/Oct 96), 37-52. Christenson is a Cornell professor and author of books and articles related to China-US relations and conflicts while at Princeton. For this Harvard funded essay, he conducted dozens of interviews with Chinese military and civilian analysts during three separate month-long trips to Beijing. These analysts are the ones who brief and provide advice to relevant governmental decision-makers: the PLA, the Foreign Ministry, the State Council and Chinese Intelligence Agency. He argues that the Chinese security analysts think about their nation's security like realpolitik scholars, such as Carr, Morgenthau and Kissinger, which may be rooted to their dynastic eras. See Alastair, Iain, *Cultural Realism, Strategic Culture and Grand Strategy in Chinese History*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995.

⁶ Doyle, Michael, *Kant, Liberal Legacies, and Foreign Affairs, Part 2*, Philosophy and Public Affairs, Vol. 12 No 4 (Fall 1983), 323-353. This is the second part of a two-part article addressing the question posed in the first part with numerous references to Kant's views: What difference do liberal principles and institutions make to the conduct of the foreign affairs of liberal states?

⁷ Huntington, Samuel, *The Clash of Civilizations?*, Air Command and Staff College Strategic Environment Coursebook, 1996a, 48-63.

⁸ Huntington, Samuel, *The West Unique, Not Universal*, Foreign Affairs, Vol 75 No 6 (Nov/Dec 96b), 28-46.

Chapter 2

Applying Doyle And Huntington to the Cauldron

Once China becomes strong enough to stand alone, it might discard us. A little later it might even turn against us, if its perception of its interests requires it.

—Kissinger, 1979

As for the United States] for a relatively long time it will be absolutely necessary that we quietly nurse our sense of vengeance...We must conceal our abilities and bide our time.

—Lt Gen Mi Zhenyu, 1996
Vice Commandant of
Military Science, Beijing

Introduction

On 20 Feb 97, Deng Xiaoping died, marking a new period of uncertainty in the midst of a rocky relationship. There have been numerous touchy situations since the tragedy of Tiananmen Square. For the near-term, most analysts believe bold action is unlikely by the new Chinese leadership while preoccupied with consolidating their power.¹ The death of Deng, who was generally viewed as pro-American, adds a joker to a chancy deck as China faces a number of challenges in achieving its historical legacy. Now is the time to reassess what US policy has achieved and is likely to achieve with the dilemma presented by the new Chinese leadership and their apparent strategic goals. The theories of Doyle and Huntington offer us insight to pertinent aspects of the “fault lines” in US/China relations.

They offer a reasonable and manageable framework to shed light on these underlying sources of conflict.

Doyle's Theory: Liberal US Policy Implications With A Non-Liberal China

Doyle argues that there are two significant legacies of liberal states. First, liberal countries have tended to maintain peaceful relationships with each other. Other democracies are seen as natural allies. They tend to negotiate with other liberal states based on mutual respect, restraint, and accommodation. The second legacy notes that peaceful restraint only seems to work in the liberal's relations with other liberal countries. Liberal states have fought numerous wars with non-liberal states. Dealings with non-liberal states have shown a proclivity to a striking mistrust in dealing with powerful non-liberal states and to invade weak non-liberal states. For powerful non-liberal states, this mistrust has too often been characterized by failures of diplomacy.²

These legacies have a profound applicability in the US relationship with China in the East Asia region. The last century and a half, the US has only seen and dealt with a China in the analogous role of a weak non-liberal state. China is still struggling to overcome its “century of shame” and to ensure control over its own destiny (App B). China is transforming itself before the eyes of the US into a powerful rival, or perhaps partner, in East Asia. As RAND stated:

The Chinese concept of “comprehensive national strength,” first evident in the 80s, reflects Beijing’s awareness of **the need to develop all dimensions of national power to attain the status of a great power** (emphasis added)...this concept includes a clear prioritization...military reform and modernization have been made subordinate to and dependent upon civilian economic growth...China’s primary foreign policy objective has become the maintenance of a placid regional and global environment

conducive to the successful implementation of domestic reform and creation of a strong, modern economy.³

It appears the US is experiencing difficulty in accepting and acting upon this in-progress fundamental change in status. The US, as shown in its recent regional policies, has not overcome the inclination to publicly dictate rather than negotiate as relative equals based on mutual respect and recognition of their different politics, culture, and history. Failure to do so may yet lead to a war neither truly desires as mistrust is magnified and malicious intent replaces the natural role of error. Misperception and miscommunication may then become predominant in the relation.

The “enlargement” portion of the NSS has the hallmarks of a gentler version of the aggressive crusades undertaken by democracies, as observed by Doyle, to expand the free world of mutual security, civil liberties, private property, and democratic rule. He noted these moral crusades led to enormous suffering in the past with only infrequent success in transplanting democratic rule to non-liberal states.⁴ The third pillar of US policy regarding this region states:

East Asia is a region of growing importance for U.S. security and prosperity...security, open markets, and democracy go hand in hand in our approach...an integrated strategy—a **New Pacific Community**—which links security requirements with economic realities and our concern for **democracy and human rights** (emphasis added)...to support democratic reform in the region....Democracy and human rights are universal yearnings and universal norms, just as powerful in Asia as elsewhere. We will continue to press for improved respect for human rights in such countries as China...⁵

This enlargement policy may be unnecessarily provocative to press China when it is well known that the CCP has put no political reform for the present as one of its pillars. The current regime maintained its rule and power by suppressing the Tiananmen Square

movement as “a conspiracy to overthrow the government.”⁶ It also seems to be inconsistent with employment of the “engagement” component that attempts to peacefully integrate China into the international system. Each attack by the US on China’s human rights abuses and non-liberal ways could be viewed by the CCP leadership as a ploy to undermine their regime.

The emphasis on human rights within the NSS, seems to support Doyle’s contention, that liberal states assume that non-liberal states, which do not rest on free consent, are not just (e.g., lack moral legitimacy).⁷ They are perceived to almost be in a state of aggression against their people and become suspect. This domestic oppression in violation of the “universal norms of human rights” allows the liberal state to intervene to address the rights of the individuals.⁸ The US seems to view the Chinese leadership as unduly suppressing their people who need succor. Thus, the US educates the Chinese people through The Voice of America among other “missionary” tactics while calling for China to play by civilized international rules and open up to the world. This rests in part on the belief that it has come too far for westward-momentum to slow down, even after Tiananmen.⁹ China has predictably responded negatively to this unwanted intrusion into their internal affairs.

Shambaugh, *China Quarterly* editor, wrote:

Lee’s trip (added the President of Taiwan) to the United States decisively shifted the balance of opinion in Beijing in favor of the oppositionists. **The prevailing view is that the United States is pursuing a hostile policy comprised of four interrelated components** (emphasis added). First, it is believed that the United States is trying to contain China strategically. Second, it is believed that the United States seeks to frustrate China’s emergence as a world economic power. Third, it is thought that the United States wants to permanently divide Taiwan from China, and is fueling pro-independence sentiments on the island. Fourth, Beijing sees evidence of a concerted policy to destabilize and undermine the regime and Communist

Party rule in China, with the intent of bringing about the collapse of the People's Republic itself.¹⁰

The Chinese leadership has branded US-influence as “spiritual pollution” (meaning the corrupting spread of Western influence and morality to weaken Chinese values and traditions) and a US-engineered effort to undermine the PRC through “peaceful evolution” (meaning a perceived US plot to peacefully overthrow the current regime by evolving China into a more friendly democracy). Secretary of State Christopher added fuel to this fire when he stated during his confirmation hearings that US policy should be to “peacefully evolve China towards democracy.”¹¹ The Chinese leadership believes the US intends to keep China divided and weak as in the years of the “Boxer rebellion” (App B). Thus, a foundation stone is laid into the path of future conflict with a China who will soon no longer be a weak non-liberal state. Both sides will likely become increasingly frustrated—we push, they push back.

China is often described as a rational state basing its foreign policy on self-interest and power politics. One could argue they are the ultimate “realpolitik” country, excepting the issues of Japan and Taiwan, with their socialist ideology largely discredited. China seems to act along the lines of traditional balance-of-power theorists.¹² In *Strategic Appraisal 1996*, RAND notes: “As in the past, China’s diplomatic approach remains keyed to the search for strategic leverage and greater independence of action through exploitation of rivalries and the balancing and manipulation of relations among major and emerging powers.”¹³ In the Chinese value system, sovereignty, national unification, and preserving the regime is placed above peace (App B). The natural conflicts that arise with a growing non-liberal China pragmatically testing it position within the international “pecking order,”

while seeking greater regional influence, can quickly escalate when it runs up against the most powerful liberal state vigorously pursuing “enlargement that knows no borders” in China’s backyard.

High levels of tension have also been generated in trying to apply the “engagement” component of US policy to China and the region. A prime example was the US shifting position over Most Favorable Nation (MFN) trading status and human right issues with China in 1993-94. In May 93, the President issued an executive order serving notice to Chinese leadership that they had exactly one year to improve specific areas of human rights or would not be accorded MFN status. This would have virtually meant the end of China’s growing trade surplus with the US. China correctly concluded the US’s own private corporations would fight the move with Chinese help to keep from being denied access to the largest potential market in the world (App C). The US’s only strong action over the next year was to send John Shatruk, the US top human right official and Secretary of State Christopher to China about three months before the deadline to gain compliance and publicize American concerns. The Chinese reacted angrily and refused to submit to US demands. China had already determined that the country was already experiencing too much chaos from the market reforms and could not bear the addition of Western-style human rights. They were also incensed over what amounted to foreign interference in their internal affairs.¹⁴ So they called the perceived US bluff by increasing their crackdown on activists and putting on a “blitz” with key US corporations. China held investment trade fairs in the US that were attended by over 300 top corporations and had over \$11 billion in agreements concluded.¹⁵ Subsequently, the President broke the

link between human rights and MFN status in May 94. The US could not sustain its policy at home or abroad. This kind of inconsistency in trying to keep China accommodating; will instead further encourage such aggressive behavior.

The current administration packaged their questionable solution as “Comprehensive Engagement” rather than simply deny MFN status to an intractable China on human rights abuses. This latest variant of “engagement” attempts to resolve the multiple issues with China separately to integrate the PRC peacefully and constructively into the world order.¹⁶ Its basic strategy is to isolate and deal separately with the multiple issues and components on the US-China agenda instead of creating “linkage” across issue areas that would penalize or reward China in one area for behavior in another. The shift in policy has not smoothed out the relationship. As Doyle points out, the very ties that bind liberal states together in terms of constitutional restraint, international respect for individual rights, and shared commercial interests can establish grounds for additional conflict between liberal and non-liberal states.¹⁷ He also notes that the ready access of foreign policy created by representation and division of power multiplies the impact of limited trust and contact with a non-liberal state that can impair strategic and morale intent.¹⁸ Three years have passed with numerous clashes in the individual issues, such as military confrontations, weapons proliferation, human rights abuses, and trade difficulties, without a single successful resolution. This is in accordance with Doyle’s view that relations between powerful liberal and non-liberal states are strewn with missed opportunities of negotiation and failures of diplomacy.¹⁹ The simmering pot of contentious issues awaits for a consistent

and realistic policy in dealing with a changing China. If not, this will give rise to increasing frustration and mistrust that may yet erupt into military hostilities.

As Doyle noted: “Liberal states invade weak non-liberal states and display striking distrust in dealings with powerful nonliberal states.”²⁰ China seems to be nearing the completion of its transition from a weak to a powerful non-liberal state. Yet, the US still has not completely shaken off the propensity to simply do as it wishes, such as invading China through export of the superiority of Western ways or publicly prescribing conditions to the PRC. Typifying this tendency and the havoc caused by the US’s division of power, the “private visit” of Taiwanese President Lee arguably precipitated the most serious crisis in US-China relations since Tiananmen. The US’s fickle policy and lack of respect towards China’s sensibilities struck when Congress took it upon itself to back on old friend, Taiwan, and put China in its place.²¹ This game of partisan politics on the behalf of lobbyists and “one-upmanship” seems to be a dangerous one at this sensitive juncture of China’s policy formulation with a new leadership taking charge.

The sum of these sources of misperception and miscommunication can lead to a sense of frustration and mistrust, increasing suspicion, lack of respect, and the beginnings of hostility. As Doyle wrote: “In short, fellow liberals benefit from a presumption of amity; nonliberals suffer from a presumption of enmity.”²² Non-liberal states are seen as secretive, aggressive, and constantly setting traps for the unwary. The analogy of the Cold War with the Soviet Union readily comes to mind as Communism aggression had to be contained. During this period, China itself was subjected to alternating moods that were largely ideological based. In striking similarity to the present, China went from being

less ruthless and more organic to their culture to being an oppressive totalitarian state—a “Soviet Manchucko.”²³ Not surprisingly, the often erratic liberal policies augments the sense of discord by creating a hostile environment and squandering opportunities—a self-fulfilling prophecy leading to otherwise avoidable conflict.

Huntington’s Theories: Clash Between Two Civilizations and Cultural Backlash

Another route to examine underlying sources of conflict is to examine the impact of cultural differences between the two countries. Huntington provides an avenue by making the case that the fundamental source of conflict will primarily be cultural in the new world order unfolding. The nation-state will remain the most powerful actors in world affairs but the clash of civilizations will dominate global politics, especially along the historical “fault lines.”²⁴ Further, the preeminence of the West and aggressive export of its culture and domination of international institutions could set up a “cultural backlash” with the non-western parts of the world.²⁵ Another tantalizing thought shared is the increased communication and sense of cooperation growing between Islamic and Confucian (such as, China) nation-states to challenge Western interests and power. He emphasizes the importance of the West to strengthen itself by renewed unity internally as well as identifying and pursuing elements of commonality with the other civilizations for coexistence.²⁶

The grounds for potential conflict with China can also be traced into the cultural differences along the “fault line” where East meets West. Insight can be gained by looking at a “fault line” that is quite familiar to the West—the divide between Islam, Orthodox

Christianity, and Western Christianity. Conflict has been on-going for over 1,300 years with the break up of Yugoslavia being the latest, but definitely not the most violent. The position of the line along with its inherent conflict has followed the rise and fall of the empires on either side.²⁷ The centuries-old military confrontations are unlikely to recede or decline. Many such wars have been fought in this century alone; the most recent being Desert Storm and Bosnia.

Unlike Islam and Orthodox Christianity, the western nations have not seen the same type of prolonged and violent conflicts against Asian nations. This has more to do with the relative superiority of the Europeans, which remained true until recently, since significant contact was made. The Chinese tried to limit contact with these “barbarians” back in the eighteenth century but made the mistake of underestimating the technological superiority and cultural-economic aggressiveness of the Europeans. The Chinese attention was then focused on territorial integrity and ethnic problems as the Europeans steadily rolled over them. China had also neglected its maritime security and strategies—a lesson which China is unlikely to forget.²⁸

Japan was the first time Asian country that managed to become powerful on par with the US and the Europeans earlier in this century. Several conflicts between the US and Japan ensued over a host of issues. Eventually, Japan saw no recourse other than war when the US imposed an embargo of critically needed resources among other measures. Post-World War II, the US occupied Japan and molded key aspects of today’s Japanese democracy.²⁹ Japan has remained virtually demilitarized with security guaranteed by the US. The unique situation that has evolved between Japan and the US has not seen

significant conflict outside assorted economic issues handled against the setting of a strong US military presence. The current NSS shows the US has not forgotten its previous Pacific wars (App A).

The East-West “fault line” is growing around Japan, Taiwan, and South China Sea as the US implements its NSS against a looming rivalry with China. The NSS clearly shows this region warrants the most pressing need for continued engagement with the US as the regional leader. It notes the profound stake in the US helping China modernize in ways that contribute to the overall security and prosperity of the Asia Pacific region (App A). China believes this represents hegemonic behavior and power politic tactics that challenge its core national interests. Their foreign policy is shaped to counter this effort. Their belief resides in a mindset that grows directly out of Chinese history and the “century of shame.”³⁰ China’s preeminent national security concern has always been its frontiers and territorial integrity. Its history has also shown the value of “Chinese nationalism” (App B) which is the antithesis of what the US is trying to do in the region. This aspect of Chinese culture is pertinent to future conflict with the US. For a country historically pre-eminent in its region, any attempt to prescribe China’s institutions and domestic practices would cause deep resentment which is magnified by its humiliating relations with the West since the mid-1800s. There will be no unilateral dictating to a capable China.

China can trace its origin as a state to over 2,400 years and traditionally calls itself the “Middle Kingdom.” Lucian Pye stated: “[China is] a civilization pretending to be a state.”³¹ Its rulers were considered operating under the “Mandate from Heaven” whenever the nation was strong and prosperous. Stability carried its own legitimacy in this

highly structured and authoritarian society. Obedience to the state and family lay at its core. Historically, these self-sufficient (or arrogant, as viewed by some) people have confidently known their placement in the world (App B). Their viewpoint circulates the belief that they are the most important civilization on earth, the center of the universe under heaven, and possessing an admirable system of government and society. This belief is summarized by the term “Sinocentric” and is frequently part of their classical foreign policy to others on the periphery. This hierarchical and presumptuous belief when combined with foreign policy has often provoked strong reactions and warfare.³² This cultural aspect also makes it unacceptable for the Chinese leadership to appear weak or be embarrassed in front of its citizens or the world (App C). This in part explains why so much Chinese diplomacy is subtle and indirect in its language and approach. The initial positive Chinese responses to Nixon attempt at rapport were largely not picked up by the US, according to Kissinger.³³ The “peaceful” US policy of enlargement and engagement may provoke the Sinocentric view to come into the fore. At the least, the senior Chinese leadership can use it to help raise support from the people when calling on their nationalism and traditional Chinese culture—a ready source of combustible material for uniting the nation.

Huntington expounds the thought that modernization and economic development do not lead to westernization; rather, it promotes a resurgence of nationalism and renewed commitment to indigenous culture. This is due to a crisis in identity caused by the chaotic transition. Additionally, the growing strength of the nation’s economic wealth and military power encourages the people to have confidence in their heritage and become

more culturally assertive. He noted that the return is most marked in Asian and Islamic societies.³⁴ In Mar 96, Prime Minister Mahathir of Malaysia, told the assembled heads of European governments: “European values are European values; Asian values are universal values. Democracies are only beginning to learn that too much freedom is dangerous.”³⁵

³⁶

The current US policy for this region may contribute to such a “cultural backlash” with China. Several East Asian societies have undergone the process of rediscovering indigenous values while noting US “double standards” in its policies. Many Asian politicians are proclaiming the superiority of “The Asian Way.” These Neo-Confucianists insist their cultural values are better than western ones, as they indulge individual freedom at the expense of society as a whole.³⁷ It is noticed that democracy is promoted as long as Islamic fundamentalists do not come into power; nonproliferation is for Iraq and Iran but not Israel; free trade is pushed except for agriculture; human rights are an issue with China but not Saudi Arabia; massive force is immediately used to support Kuwait but not oil-less Bosnia.³⁸ Regarding the rediscovery of Asian culture, a synthesis of Prime Minister Tong of Singapore address on National Day in 1994, is illuminating. He praised the Singapore people for their adherence to Asian culture of putting the needs of society above those of the individual. He showed how the US and British society have gone wrong very quickly. They could learn from Asia by turning to the tradition of politeness and deference to their elders, to not bring shame to the family, strictly obey the law and harsh punishment for the crime, and the man is the primary provider and responsible for the child he fathers. He

believes that the western nations have forgotten to balance the rights of the individual against their responsibilities and sense of social obligation.³⁹

China has shown to be less malleable to foreign influences than other East Asian societies. The Chinese culture (App B) has historically displayed a strong xenophobic tendency to bolster the power of the leadership by an overwhelming focus on maintaining its integrity against foreign incursions.⁴⁰ The “Overseas Chinese” (App B), who are an important economic component of many Asian nations, supply an example. They are noted for having non-integrative behavior into a foreign host society. They are renowned for being clannish, their children are educated in separate Chinese-speaking schools, and most of their profits are sent back to the homeland for investment in China. This behavior has been going on for several hundreds of years.⁴¹ Furthermore, almost 80% of foreign investment in China comes from these Overseas Chinese.⁴² The history of China is replete with examples of selectively borrowing from other civilizations in ways that enhance their own (App B). China’s absorption of India’s Buddhism was reshaped into the Chinese image. The barbarian conquests of China during the Six Dynasties and Mongol dynasty resulted in little impact to the Chinese culture as the conquerors adapted to the Chinese way. The over 100 years that the Japanese and Europeans dominated China left insignificant adoption of their cultures. China has always either limited contact with the barbarians (e.g., The Great Wall) or when weak, co-opted them to the Chinese way by its very number or simply outlasted them.⁴³ Huntington noted that China has also defeated any large scale intrusion of Christianity into their society.⁴⁴ Given the enduring value of its 2,400 years old culture, China will probably continue to “pick and choose” what portions

of the West to incorporate during its modernization. They seem to be especially wary of Japanese and American influences given their recent history of the last 150 years. The harder we try to enlarge in China, the higher the likelihood of a “cultural backlash” will happen.

In this vein, Huntington offered an intriguing view that a Confucian-Islamic connection is forming to challenge and compete against Western interests, values and power.⁴⁵ China has been cultivating its influence with the Third World, especially the Middle East, for over 40 years. Despite repeated negative impact to relations with the US, China has continued its weapons proliferation to these countries (App C). China is known for taking the long view in achieving its goals along with the willingness to take carefully calculated risks to see “what the market will bear.” China has also used the forum of the United Nations (UN) and other international organizations to further its ties with these countries to achieve respect and “goodwill” chips (App B). China is developing a concept of its global role as a powerful economic power backed by a credible military force and alliances.⁴⁶ This leads naturally to building up relationships with useful countries in rivalry with the West to act as a counterweight and deterrent. Increasing the size of its military and its choice of allies sets another capstone into the potential confrontation with the US as the misperception of unwarranted aggression replaces the natural “balancing of power” between an established power and an emerging one.

The recent rise of China’s power is culturally viewed as just another upswing in the eternal cycles of China with its dynasties. A review of Chinese history (App B) reveals that China is in the beginning of its seventh major cycle of prosperity and strength.

Typically, these cycles take 40-50 years until equilibrium are reached and normally last about 200-350 years. China is clearly on the rebound in the eyes of its leadership. Soon it will be ready to take its rightful place of preeminence in the region that was lost during its last period of decline.⁴⁷ Cooperation with the US is important now to allow China to build up its economic strength and acquire needed technology while buying time to build up a credible military force to regain control of its destiny.

Another powerful cultural impetus for China is the “fear of chaos” linked to their numerous periods of anarchy.⁴⁸ Historically, the leadership has played upon this fear coupled with the Sinocentric belief to unite the people when it establishes a new dynasty. Another important concept is the tendency to “splittism” when China undergoes foreign incursions or the dynasty is weak. Basically, China tends to “split” not unlike how the Soviet Union did. Unlike Russia, however, China has experienced this phenomenon many times over the last 2,400 years. The CCP recognizes the imperative of using nationalistic ideology to retain power with the obliteration of communism by the market reforms introduced by Deng. Since the CCP is not really communist; it must be even more Chinese.⁴⁹ Taiwan will become a greater “flashpoint” of conflict from a cultural viewpoint as China normally unites its national territory when on an upswing (App B). With the return of Hong Kong and Macao, Taiwan represents the last remaining outstanding province—one that is in rebellion with the latest dynasty.⁵⁰

A look at the cultural aspects of the sources of conflict can not be complete without reviewing the Chinese way of warfare. Combat has shown much utility for China but is not glorified. Soldiering is not normally viewed as an honorable occupation though it is a

frequent and necessary occurrence.⁵¹ Sun Tzu, the author of the classic *The Art of War*, typifies Chinese philosophy of the warfare. His short treatise set out principles for prosecuting victorious war based on indirect strategy; economy of means, stratagems, knowledge of the adversary, and psychological action was everything to disorient the enemy. Supreme victory occurred by breaking the enemy's resistance without fighting.⁵² Chinese society sees conflict as routine, war as legitimate, and power and force as the basis of political authority. This has been true regardless of which period of Chinese history was being discussed through the present, including Tiananmen Square in 1989.⁵³ Mao often said: "Political power grows out of the barrel of a gun." Fortunately, China has remained essentially an a "stay at home" people (over 70% rural population). They believe the world should come to them. Given their serious border problems and internal anarchy, China uses force to stabilize their borders so they can concentrate on the more serious internal problems.⁵⁴ The "fault line" arguably growing around Taiwan, Japan, and the South China Sea can be traced back to this 2,400 year tradition of using forces on its forward borders and internally to maintain stability and security. This in itself can be seen as a source of conflict with the US who may view it as aggressive intent to expand and conquer others.

Summing Up

The US policy of engagement and enlargement has and will continue to encounter resistance from a growing China and is enflaming the CCP mistrust of US intentions. In turn, the US will continue to be frustrated in its efforts and will misperceive China's behavior negatively. The "downward spiral" of their relations will deepen unless first a

more appropriate cognizance of this worsening situation is accomplished followed by taking effective action. The theories of Doyle and Huntington provided a means to examine the underlying sources of conflict between the US and China, including the associated misunderstandings and misperceptions. The ideals and theoretical framework from this chapter will shape the next chapter's case study discussion.

Doyle's argument concerning liberal states' failures of negotiation and mistrust of non-liberal states is pertinent to US/China relations. The past decade has seen the warm relations turn frigid without the unifying glue of a common enemy in the form of the Soviet Union. The US policy seems to be inconsistent in treating China for the most part as a weak non-liberal state to whom it can prescribe and be a recipient of the US's active export of democracy and human rights. This policy is being pursued with little apparent regard to the ongoing transformation of China into a powerful non-liberal state or accounting for the PRC's domestic and foreign policies. An angry, "realpolitik" China has responded to these perceived attacks to its core by gradually coming to see the US as its principal enemy in the long-term, although peaceful relations are seen as vital in the short-term to support China's economic surge and modernization efforts. The MFN status fiasco demonstrated the need for firm and consistent dealings with China to gain its respect and accommodation. The inconclusive application of "Comprehensive Engagement" could give rise to increasing mistrust leading to intensification of the conflict. The US must fully recognize and account for China's changing status, including an understanding of its rival's (or partner's) perspective, by reshaping its policy to reflect a more compatible appraisal of the emerging new world order. Otherwise, Doyle's

assertion of missed opportunities to reduce tensions through a presumption of enmity will hit the mark when the various misperceptions and suspicions lead to the ultimate failure of diplomacy—war.

When the underlying sources of conflict are sliced culturally, Huntington offers remarkable insight to why relations between the US and China will likely see increasing conflict as these two civilizations interact more closely. He argues cultural sources of conflict will likely come to dominate politics, especially along “fault lines” as evidenced by Bosnia. The only prior situation where a strong Asian civilization resolutely interacted with a powerful Western nation resulted in a major war. When comparing a climbing Confucian China against current US policy and the NSS, one could argue that a “fault line,” as ascertained from Huntington’s notions, is growing around Japan, Taiwan, and the South China Sea. The US seems to be seeking to maintain the “status quo” in East Asia without an appreciation of China’s historical legacy, its Sinocentric beliefs, and the effect of its previous humiliations to Japan and the West. This has contributed to China establishing ties with Islamic countries as a seemingly counterweight to the powerful Western civilization. The US has also failed to grasp the subtlety required in dealing with China and underestimates the importance of any cultural change being accomplished in the uniquely Chinese way. The sustained forceful exportation of westernization will likely result in a “cultural backlash” that could lead to increased hostility and bring China’s nationalism to the fore.

As China grows stronger, it will look to resume its historical position as the region’s “Great Power” and likely seek a corresponding reduction in US influence within the

region. The Chinese culturally regard war as an integral part of successful politics. This tenet is balanced by China being essentially a non-expansive country that tends to focus on territorial integrity, maintaining secured borders, and acting as the regional power. The US could misconstrue its resistance and aggressive behavior in a manner that leads to overreaction and further hostility if not viewed from the Chinese perspective of seeking the fitting “balance of power” for the region.

Careful application of Doyle's and Huntington's theories reveals that the normal conflict between an established power and an emerging one is ominously compounded by the inherent tensions between a powerful liberal and non-liberal state on top of the cultural clashes between two powerful civilizations. Yet, neither side seems to desire war unless it becomes an absolute necessity. Conflict could perhaps be avoided by the US pragmatically taking the long-view in dealing with China as an equal based on mutual respect and recognition of their differences in core interests, political structure, and cultural beliefs rather than on misperceptions and mistrust.

Notes

¹ Page, Susan, *US Hopes For “Continuity” With China*, USA Today, 20 Feb 97, 9A. Various analysts and government officials were interviewed. Their general consensus are captured by this statement.

² Doyle, 323-326.

³ Khalilzad, 197.

⁴ Doyle, Michael, *Rethinking America's Security: An International Liberal Community* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1992), 311.

⁵ The White House, 41.

⁶ Sullivan, Lawrence China Since Tiananmen (New York: East Gate, 1995), 297.

⁷ Doyle (1992), 313.

⁸ Doyle (1983), 325-330.

⁹ Berstein, 96.

¹⁰ Shambaugh, David, *The United States and China: A New Cold War?*, Current History, Sep 95, 242.

¹¹ Ibid, 247.

Notes

¹² Christensen, 37.

¹³ Khalilzad, Zalmay, *Project Air Force: Strategic Appraisal 1996* (Santa Monica: RAND), 196-198. This book draws primarily on the expertise of RAND researchers and was sponsored by the USAF. Particular attention is paid to the political situation in each region in regards to US interests and the possibility of US military involvement. The portion quoted relates use of apparent realpolitik and balance-of-power politics as the foundation of Chinese diplomacy, including the use of economic incentives.

¹⁴ Bernstein, 100.

¹⁵ Ibid, 101. In a span of a few months, China transformed several fortune 500 companies into a virtual and formidable “New China” lobby group.

¹⁶ Ibid, 243. It should be noted that Secretary Perry and other senior Pentagon officials have been among the most ardent advocates of comprehensive engagement and building peaceful ties with the Chinese military.

¹⁷ Doyle (1992), 315.

¹⁸ Doyle (1983), 326.

¹⁹ Ibid, 323-331.

²⁰ Doyle (1992), 311.

²¹ Shambaugh, 242-243.

²² Doyle (1992), 314.

²³ Doyle (1983), 330-331. Liberalism has encouraged a tendency to misread communist threats in the Third World. Since communism is seen as inherently aggressive, Soviet aid is seen as attempts to destabilize while Western aid is to protect allies. The actual dependence of regimes, such as the PRC, on their respective superpower and anti-colonialism were discounted. The term “Soviet Manchukuo” denotes China as an extended province of the Soviet Union.

²⁴ Huntington (1996a), 48

²⁵ Huntington (1996b), 37. This belief is largely based on the view that modernization and economic development neither require nor produce cultural westernization. To the contrary, they promote a resurgence of, and renewed commitment to, indigenous cultures.

²⁶ Huntington (1996a), 57, 63. The implication is that non-western civilizations will continue to grow stronger relative to the West without becoming more western. This requires the West to maintain the economic and military power necessary to protect its interests in relation to those civilizations as well as identifying elements of commonality with the other civilizations for co-existence. Both of these require a united West.

²⁷ Ibid, 52-54.

²⁸ Grinter, Lawrence, Conflict, Culture, & History: *Cultural and Historical Influences on Conflict in Sinic Asia: China, Japan, and Vietnam* (Maxwell AFB, Ala.: Air University Press, January 1993), 141-142. This source provides a more detailed account of Chinese history and culture as it relates to conflict.

²⁹ Manchester, Douglas, *American Caesar* (New York: Laurel, 1983), 586-595. MacArthur on his own initiative introduced democracy, woman suffrage, freedom of information, and key elements of their new constitution to Japan after WWII.

³⁰ Shambaugh, 246.

Notes

³¹ Huntington (1996a), 49.

³² Grinter, Lawrence, 138-140.

³³ Kissinger, Henry, *Diplomacy* (New York: Touchstone, 1995), 725.

³⁴ Huntington (1996b), 37.

³⁵ Ibid., 41.

³⁶ Ried, T.R., *Confucius Says: Go East, Young Man*, The Washington Post, 19 Nov 92, C2.

³⁷ Ibid, C2.

³⁸ Huntington (1996b), 37-41.

³⁹ Tong Goh, *Social Values, Singapore Style*, Air Command and Staff College Strategic Environment Coursebook, 1996, 140-147.

⁴⁰ Bernstein, 4.

⁴¹ Dreyer, 404.

⁴² Segal, 117.

⁴³ Grinter, 122, 128, 130-132.

⁴⁴ Huntington (1996b), 36.

⁴⁵ Huntington (1996a), 60. One interesting aspect of this connection vis-a-vis to the West is the observation that they are significantly expanding their military capabilities while the West is reducing their military power. The non-western states view arms control as a way for the West to keep them from developing and threatening Western interests.

⁴⁶ Bernstein, 19.

⁴⁷ Ibid., 164.

⁴⁸ Saich Tony, *The Search for Civil Society and Democracy in China*, Air Command and Staff College Strategic Environment Coursebook, 1996, 134. This fear of chaos is also closely linked to the “Cultural Revolution” of 1966 to 1969 when millions died before it ran its course.

⁴⁹ Christenson, 46.

⁵⁰ Bernstein, 163-165.

⁵¹ Grinter, 139.

⁵² Chaliand, Gerard, *The Art of War in World History* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994), 221.

⁵³ Grinter, 181.

⁵⁴ Ibid., 182.

Chapter 3

Case Study Analysis: Tiananmen Square Impact

Our object now, as then, is to vindicate the principles of peace and justice in the life of the world as against selfish and autocratic power and set up amongst the really free and self-governed people of the world such concert of purpose and action as will henceforth ensure the observance of those principles.

—Woodrow Wilson, 1917

The turmoil and rebellion that occurred in late spring this year was a result of the combination of the international climate and domestic climate. Hostile forces at home and abroad created this turmoil to overthrow the leadership of the CCP, subvert the socialist system, and turn China into a bourgeois republic and into an appendage of big Western capitalist powers once again.

—Jiang Zemin, 1989

Introduction

Since the tragedy of Tiananmen Square in 1989, the United States has seemingly faced not one but two Chinas. One is the economic reformist who is outgoing, moderate, and pragmatic; who seems to see the US as a strategic partner, technological helpmate, and economic inspiration. The other China is a “realpolitik” xenophobic, who appears to be defensive, closed, and angry; who sees the US as a moral and cultural danger to China and its national ambitions. The actions of both have influenced the US’s attitude and perception of which one it is. It can be helpful to examine a “trigger event,” such as Tiananmen Square, to better comprehend subsequent interchanges as well as project

probable trends between these two powers. A detailed chronological account for this tragedy and related aftermath is located in Appendix C.

Overview of the Mass Demonstrations in Apr-Jun 1989

A balanced perspective of this defining domestic (and international) event is vital to developing a policy appropriate to the evolving new world order in the East Asian region and overcomes any misperceptions. Within China, the struggle for Tiananmen was of importance that went beyond the demonstrations themselves. Tiananmen Square is a revered national symbol as it is the most sacred square in the most sacred city.¹ The death of Hu, a popular deposed reformist, triggered the ensuing seven weeks of the mass movement that followed.² Student-led demonstrations had previously occurred several times without incident. This time, however, the students seemed to be caught in a vortex, not knowing how to get out intact, as the demonstration developed a momentum of its own. The build up led the CCP to take decisive action that put an end, albeit a bloody one, to this unique movement in modern day China.³

The mass movement (consisting mainly of students and intellectuals) was unique for modern day China. All prior large-scale and diverse marches were supported by someone in authority. However, the diversity of the movement was limited to urban participants, even then only a few workers and ordinary citizens actively participated, since the countryside did not mobilize in support. After the student hunger strikes began, the Beijing citizens did play a surprising though passive role in sheltering and protecting the students and the sacredness of Beijing itself from military confrontation. The various

participants had no unified goal beyond unspecified democratic reform and expressing their general discontent.

The principal sources of discontent contributing to this mass movement can be traced to problems associated with the “four modernizations” (agriculture, industry, defense and science & technology) reforms. China was experiencing a growing inequity between the provinces, a high inflation rate of 25-35%, rising corruption throughout society, a large transient population, and media exposure of the good life in other Asian countries. Political reform was also designated as taboo during the modernization effort. The sum of these problems led to a general sense of dissatisfaction, followed by frustration and disenchantment.⁴ Economically, the Chinese yearned for the material comforts afforded by Western capitalist society. However, it was balanced with a genuine understanding that any new political order must assume a Chinese character with the knowledge that the Western democratic system has its own deficiencies.⁵ It must be noted that to most Chinese the word “democratic” just means a voice in government and Party decisions; unlike the traditional western definition.⁶ Chinese dread anarchy and desire stability above individual freedoms (App B). The Confucian ideal of law is moral arbitration as that associated with the biblical King Solomon, which is in sharp contrast to highly codified Western law.⁷ Any division of power would probably need to reflect this strong Chinese cultural trait. A central authority figure is also an intricate part of Chinese culture. They seemed to be looking for authority that was more responsive to the needs and interests of the masses.⁸

The Party was itself in a strong state of flux which contributed greatly to the muddled handling of the crisis. It was literally caught in the middle of a touchy leadership transition to the “technocrats” in addition to the usual battles between reformers and hard-liners. Morale among the bureaucracy was uneven with the unleashing of the market forces in addition to the uncertainties of the ongoing transfer of power. Still, there was no overwhelming desire by the CCP or the people for Western democracy.⁹ The multiple international events, along with the presence of the media, put China’s reputation on the line thereby hindered its resolution. The diverse participants mistook the initial mixed, ineffective response by the government as a “green” light to proceed further. In reality, a classic power struggle between Zhao and the reformers against Deng and the status quo was taking place.¹⁰ Nevertheless, the participation expanded in scope and saw the goals expand further to unobtainable levels barring an overthrow of the government itself. The CCP made every attempt to resolve this peacefully without “losing face” or jeopardizing their ability to rule the country. It is likely that the CCP misjudged the lengths that the Beijing citizens were willing to go to protect the students and defend their tradition of peace. Sadly, this great failure led to a much higher death toll and destruction than the leaders anticipated when they gave the final orders to use any means necessary to end it.

The senior CCP leadership, in the aftermath of this tragedy, has reacted strongly to the slightest hint of organized dissent. They have united to steadfastly ride out the condemnations and patiently waited for the lure of China’s huge market to bring back the industrialized nations. All current senior Chinese leaders believe the nation needs a one-party system to contain dissent while the chaotic reforms continue. The Tiananmen

Square episode helped demonstrate the importance of consensus to decision-making in Chinese politics. The dismissal of Zhao, well known as a reformist moderate, has hindered US/China relations by removing the most pro-American senior Chinese official from an important post.¹¹ The resulting shift towards the hard-liners has strengthened the sense that the demonstrations to bring down the CCP were inspired by the US. The quick US action, to grant asylum and suspend all high level contact with China, enflamed a growing hostile attitude towards America and its poisonous ideas about democracy.¹² One could argue the debacle of Tiananmen Square, including the strong belief in the role “US-exported democracy” played, is one of the cornerstones for the senior Chinese leadership’s relative consensus that the US is China’s chief adversary in the post-Cold War world.

Tiananmen-Related China/US Misperceptions and Miscommunications

The events of Tiananmen Square have had a profound impact on US-China relations. With the fall of the Soviet Union and the emergence of China as a growing power, a careful and regular dialogue between the two countries is vital. Kissinger wrote in his book, *Diplomacy*:

For four years after the events of Tiananmen Square in 1989, this dialogue was inhibited by the American refusal to engage in high-level contacts—a measure never employed against the Soviet Union even at the height of the Cold war. Human rights thus moved to the center of the Sino-American relationship.¹³

Several critical years were lost while a moderately pro-American Deng was in charge and China’s economy grew 10% annually. The US has seen China making good use of its economic hammer through judicious employment of varying trade barriers and by working directly with US private corporations. With the incessant battering from the US and

removal of Zhao, the sentiment of senior leadership, in line with Doyle's views, shifted towards regarding the US as its greatest threat and the recognition that a credible military force was a necessity.¹⁴ The last few years have seen their views harden as mutual suspicion of the other's intentions increases.

The primary effect of Tiananmen Square was replacing the practical and beneficial working relationship with one increasingly hostile, fraught with distrust, and a pervasive sense of conflicting goals and interests. The US suspension of high-level contacts, putting human rights to the fore, and threats regarding China's MFN status, served the US poorly as it has slowly led China to respond in kind to avoid embarrassment among its people and the world—a strong China can not be threatened nor be dictated to. The CCP has also tilted towards the hard-liners. It increasingly plays the national card, as alluded to by Huntington, to its people besides distracting them with Deng's "your duty is to get rich" slogan. Regional military hostilities, which neither desire and are even trying to prevent, could be only a decade or so away.

Tiananmen Square exposed the fact that the US and China had little in common besides feelings of enmity towards the Soviet Union. A strategic relationship was forged while contentious issues were subsumed, for instance Taiwan, China's opaque market, and US technology transfer.¹⁵ With the end of the Cold War, only a "trigger" event, like Tiananmen, was needed to bring these differences back to the fore. First, the US became the only "Great Power" and could be expected to spread democracy and its influence now that it was free to do so. On the other side, China is committed against "hegemonic" behavior and sees the world through Sinocentric cultural glasses. The resulting clashes

from these incompatible core interests seem to support Huntington's premises. Second, the subsumed issues were now open for discussion and readily available to induce conflict while unsettled (App C). Third, China has perceived a US agenda of introducing change in China and is mindful of the example provided by post-WWII Japan. This agenda has been going on, in their view, since the late Qing dynasty up to the present as embodied in the current US policies and the NSS.¹⁶ China believes it should determine how and when to change without coercive US help from the supposed campaigns of "peaceful evolution" and "comprehensive engagement." Fourth, the hard-liners on both sides now have a convenient target to put up as enemy number one when the "right spark" transpires.

What has evolved from the mutual awakening and reassessment of their relationship could be called a "ping pong" approach. One country will do something that nettles the other and stimulates a response in kind. The inconsistent and ill-considered nature of US policy reared its head when Jiang was trying to put some distance between himself and his competitors in early 1995. He stressed three key points: the need for anti-corruption campaigns; improve relations with the US by reciprocal visits; and better relations with Taiwan. The US promptly kicked the legs out of two-thirds of his proposed policies by encouraging Taiwan on the international scene and allowing Lee's visit.¹⁷ In a surprise move, Congress decided to show its support to Taiwan when the executive branch had assured China no such visit was planned. China then showed its displeasure by allowing some factories that pirated goods to reopen, rounded up several dissidents, and test fired a long-range mobile intercontinental ballistic missile to prick US sensibilities while demanding the US remove the negative effects of his offensive visit.¹⁸ The US

compounded the problem by incorrectly perceiving China as somehow being dangerously aggressive. The PRC misread the US's intentions as wanting to dismantle China.¹⁹ One can imagine the long-term damage with embarrassing Jiang, the new Chinese leader, in addition to China's perception of the US over this disturbing affair to Beijing at least. Of course, this type of approach possesses the inherent danger of escalation and could provide the opposition power groups the needed jockeying room to get a full-grown antagonistic rivalry underway.

The example of the Lee visit also illustrates the alarming incidence of Murphy's Law when things are improving between the two powers. China provides the example of this behavior. The US-China relations had been ragged since Tiananmen Square until the concept of "comprehensive engagement" was implemented in 1994. The separation of human rights was seen as good by China. It was unbending in regards of political reform being on hold for the present. Chinese leadership drew this lesson from their own history of "splittism" and watching the Soviet Union dissolve through what they perceived as anarchy caused by the unleashing of too many freedoms. Any US attempts to press democratic reforms and individual freedoms would be viewed as a conspiracy to allow for the same scenario to happen in China.²⁰ Cooperative interaction was renewed. Several cabinet secretaries visited China. Over \$10 billion in contracts for US firms, release of political prisoners, and military contact re-establishment was their response.²¹ Then, the Chinese decided to "test the waters" by provoking a confrontation with a US carrier battle group in the Yellow Sea and took the Philippines' Mischief Reef by armed force in the South China Sea (App C). These actions further fueled the alarm of a rogue China who

might require the possible employment of the more confrontational strategy of “containment”—a policy that would seem to be misguided without strong regional alliances firmly in place and the willingness to commence an equivalent of a second Cold War.

The US has correctly observed that China is becoming more aggressive but appears to “miss the boat” on the causes as evidenced by recent US policy and actions. The US looks as if committed to maintaining the “status quo” with itself as the leader of the Pacific community. Since Tiananmen, the US has aggressively pursued strengthening bilateral treaties with various Asian states and recently upgraded its security arrangement with Japan. The current administration has called for a New Pacific Community. The US has participated vigorously within APEC and seems to be headed to a multilateralism security arrangement, possibly using the ASEAN Regional Forum.²² These steps seem to be taken as a given with the US being the sole “Great Power” and the growing economic importance of the Pacific rim (1992 GNP was second to only Europe’s with the US third).

²³ However, China is slowly replacing Japan as the biggest player for US dealings.²⁴ China’s rise to power is also happening at a time when the world is in a great state of flux. Doyle’s assertions and Chinese history seem to imply great difficulty ahead to integrate a powerful China into the international system. They are likely to view these assertive US actions as another sign of “containment.” Especially, if a functioning multilateral security group comes into being. In this case, China can only be discerned as being aggressive and non-conformist when it attempts to counter this presumed threat. The probability of active confrontation would ostensibly climb.

China is then caught in a “temporary” dilemma. Its continued economic growth requires reasonably placid relations with the US for the near-term while it begins to acquire the accouterments of a great power in the form of a credible military and acceptable balance of power vis-à-vis with America. The China’s military watched, like a hawk, the US forces in action during Desert Storm and is busy applying the lessons they learned via their 13+% yearly increase in military spending since 1989.²⁵ A review of RAND’s appraisal of China’s expected military capabilities reveal some intriguing points. China may soon have the ability to attain a full divisional amphibious assault as well as airborne drop capability. In the larger perspective, it is anticipated the PRC will continue to improve its force structure (over the next 10 to 15 years). This is in support of a doctrine of local war and peripheral defense. Even a modest improvement in China’s power-projection capability, obtained in part from Russia, could present a weighty impediment to US interests and military presence in specific Asian subregions. It may also conceivably contribute to more assertive Chinese behavior, given their cultural beliefs, that could produce major diplomatic tensions and perhaps even armed confrontations.²⁶ As evidenced by their military modernization efforts, China seems to recognize the advantages inherent of possessing the interior lines with Chinese forces nearer than the US forces to their respective centers of power. China seems to be striving for a tailored regional force for diplomatic leverage and that is capable of holding its own against the US in calculated areas, such as Taiwan and the South China Sea, for any potential military hostilities. Table 2, on the next page, shows the recent and planned major Chinese air and naval acquisitions.²⁷

Table 2. Recent and planned Major Naval and Air Acquisitions

Branch	Type	Recent	Planned
Navy	Destroyer	3	17
	Missile Frigate	4	2
	Submarine	15	18+ (a)
	Mine Warfare Ships	100	0
	Missile Craft	9	? (a)
	SSBN	1	? (a)
	SSN	0	1-5 (a)
	Aircraft Carrier	0	1-2
	LST	5	? (a)
	Tank Landing Ship	1	? (a)
Air	Fighter (Domestic)	52/yr	N/C
	Fighter (SU-27)	26	348
	Fighter-Attack	0	? (a)
	Bomber	4/yr	? (a)
	Transport	25	? (a)

a—Indicate uncertainty about a planned quantity

Given the state of US-China relations, the PRC's economic and military modernization ties into where it all seems to be headed in the post-Deng era with continuance of present US policy.

The Mobius Strip: Future Implications of Current US Policy and Post-Deng China

Since the days of Woodrow Wilson, the US has conducted a foreign policy of varying degrees that consisted largely of collective security, conversion of opponents to American-style democracy, international systems acting as arbitrators, and unqualified support for self-determination. The latest installment is captured in the current NSS policy of engagement and enlargement. According to Kissinger, the emerging world order will likely see the US no longer the preponderate superpower, but rather, a powerful and great nation with peers.²⁸ China, with its rapid growth and historical legacy, seems likely to be

one of them. The policy of today sets the foundation for relations of the future whether it be for peace or war.

Post-Deng China will most likely operate a bit differently. Historically, leaders of his stature are rare. Deng was, in many ways, a truly great and admirable figure. China began to realize its potential under him. He did not seek to expand China's control beyond its historical borders and sponsored vastly more liberal policies than those that existed before. He was the last leader to hold the allegiance of all three key components of China: the people, the army and the CCP. He was even known to be called the "red emperor": a cultural sign of the strength of his leadership among Chinese.²⁹ Yet, his replacement was well orchestrated with Jiang apparently consolidating his power smoothly after acting as the "de facto" leader for the past few years.

The new Chinese leadership will probably continue the progress on the four modernizations under a one-party rule. Jiang has shown a willingness to improve relationships between the two countries. The two world leaders are scheduled to exchange visits over the next year. China essentially needs the US for the near-term for trade, technology, and maintenance of a peaceful environment to allow its economic growth to continue for the next decade or so. However, China is willing to do without peaceful relations with the US now if it means stopping any perceived US-led efforts to seriously weaken or "contain" China. As the PRC sees it, a regional or even global rivalry is plausible whether now or later.

Many sources of conflict exist today and could be exacerbated by continuance of the current US policy of engagement and enlargement without a full appreciation of the shift

of China from a weak non-liberal state to a powerful one, and the deeply rooted differences in their respective cultures and national strategies. China's growing economic and military strength will lead it to be more aggressive in satisfying its national ambitions. The Chinese still recall the days of the Opium Wars and the endless humiliations visited upon China by the West when it forcibly opened up the country (App B). As Kissinger wrote: "Equality of status, a fierce insistence on not bowing to foreign prescription, is for Chinese leaders not a tactic but a moral imperative."³⁰ Overreaction by the US or attempts to publicly decree conditions will likely bring out the xenophobic and Sinocentric side of China. This allows the party to wrap itself in the flag as a means of self-preservation. It can then blame the US for China's problems and be able to risk hostilities with its people rallying behind them.

Beyond misperceptions, China seems to have set a goal that is directly contrary to current US interests. RAND notes: "[Many Chinese leaders and strategists] undoubtedly view it (economic development) as largely an instrument for the eventual attainment of China's great power ambitions towards the Asia-Pacific and beyond."³¹ China appears to be headed towards restoring its historical legacy as the dominant country in the East Asia region (App B). Its goal seems aimed at ensuring that no country in the region will act without first taking China's interests into prime consideration. This would arguably entail replacing the US as the preeminent power in Asia.³² Supplanting the US would likely result in intense conflict as it would seem to require many contentious events to occur: a reduction in US influence in the region along with a diminished flow of its Western ideals into China; prevent any "contain China" alliances; keep Japan from emerging as a military

power equal to its economical strength; exert control over the essential sea lanes (i.e., South China Sea); reunification with Taiwan, or at least, maintains the current arrangement; and develop a military force tailored to support its predicted “Great Power” status. A corollary goal to offset the US involves maintaining close military cooperation with Russia and continuing to strengthen its ties with the Islamic countries and other anti-US Third World states. As its economy grows, China is liable to make more effective use of the economic instrument of power to cross borders in exerting its influence. Consistent with their customary diplomatic methods and traditional concerns, Chinese use of “realpolitik” will most probably continue to dominate their foreign policy excepting issues related to Taiwan and Japan.³³

When comparing US policy to China’s discernible strategic goal, some critical sources of conflict appear to be the US policy of enlarging democracies, retaining sole US leadership of regional security, the perception of a US intent to contain or weaken the PRC, China’s fear of a militarily strong Japan, and the issue of Taiwan getting out of control. The first three sources are viewed by the Chinese leadership as part of a continuing US aim to become the “global hegemony” that would result in a weakened China. Many Chinese analysts believe the West is using its ideals and international organizations to prevent China from becoming a great power and keep China off-balanced so domestic forces can overthrow the CCP.³⁴ The multilateral organizations, such as ASEAN and ARF, are viewed with mistrust as being readily convertible to tacit anti-China alliances linked to the US in order to accomplish the “containment” of China. Further expansion of ARF into established norms and rules on force deployment could be used to

monitor the region and provide a mechanism to put a limit on the PRC's power projection. With this in mind, China would be very reluctant to see regional forums grow or use them to settle contentious issues like their numerous border disputes, not to mention the status of Taiwan, and the potential mineral and oil-rich seabed in the South China Sea. From a "balance of power" and Sinocentric perspective, China has reason to be wary of the US-led new Pacific community that includes a strong Japanese ally.³⁵

China can recall the bitter occupation by the Japanese military of Taiwan and China itself. Chinese analysts fear the emergence of a militarily powerful Japan. This is an area where China even welcomes US military presence if it keeps Japan pacifist.³⁶ Culturally and historically, China has a deep rooted distrust of Japan. It has been involved in several downturns of China's dynastic cycles. On the other hand, the recent upgrading of the US-Japan security arrangements is viewed with deep suspicion as either being the first step in establishing a military alliance or would encourage Japan to develop its own force projection capability. The Chinese believe Japan is capable of building a more technologically advance force quickly. Further signs of these activities could lead to the consensus to quickly booster PRC's military and settle the various sovereignty disputes—by force if necessary—before its leverage is lost.³⁷

China is absolutely not a rational state actor when it comes to the issue of Taiwan. China's violent opposition to Taiwan's legal independence is deeply grounded in its history and culture: the most demeaning event during China's "century of shame" was their defeat to Japan which resulted in the loss of Taiwan. The losses to the "barbarians" (i.e., the Europeans) were difficult enough to accept. However, succumbing to a local

power (i.e., Japan), with China's long history of superiority to its tributary neighbors, was a mortal blow for the Qing dynasty. The consensus of Chinese analysts, interviewed by Christenson, was : "China would almost certainly use force against Taiwan or Taiwanese interests if Taipei actively seeks independence. China would act even if it means damaging its profitable trade and investment relations with Taiwan, and it will do so regardless of the level of the US military commitment to Taiwan's security."³⁸ How would the US, during a period of internal weakness, react to losing Hawaii to rebellion and then have China supporting its actions in a bid to remain a separate nation? Taiwan is a national symbol of the tragedy resulting from the ending of the "previous dynastic cycle." Preventing the permanent loss of Taiwan must be an important nationalist goal of any Chinese regime to rectify the "century of shame" and keep the internal "splittest" movements in check. With communism virtually dead, nationalism is the only remaining ideology to keep the CCP in power and hold China intact so retention of Taiwan is seen as integral to its very survival.

Summing Up

Tiananmen Square triggered the growing unease between the US and China into a state of near hostility as it exposed how little they had in common while unleashing many submerged issues amidst this unexpected awakening. Neither side seemed to appreciate the other's predicament during the mass demonstrations nor in the aftermath (App C). What started out as an outpouring of general discontent by way of student protests turned into a struggle requiring decisive action. The Chinese leadership viewed it purely an internal disorder that gradually became a quest to discredit the current regime and was

looked upon with pleasure, or even encouraged, by the US. America saw a brutal massacre of innocents to retain an unwanted communist regime in power and took quick action to vent its outrage through granting asylum and ceasing high-level contact. China, in turn, blamed the US and began viewing America as its greatest enemy.

Since Tiananmen, the past eight years have seen a cycle of gradual warming followed by a down turn whenever a contentious issue pops up. Despite the upswings, it seems the opposition power groups are just a step away from turning the pervasive sense of conflicting interests and distrust into active enmity. China's military build up shows an appreciation that farther diplomatic leverage is needed, by having a credible force available for possible military hostilities, to ensure successful Chinese politics. In the meantime, the liberal, Western US is vigorously pursuing its policy of enlargement and engagement. The non-liberal, Confucian China looks to reclaim its historically "Great Power" status in the region. The differing political structures, cultures, and history have generated serious misperceptions and miscommunications in place of the natural role of error and conflict between an established power and an emerging one. The antagonistic issues are numerous: the "balance of power" in East Asia and perceived hegemonic behavior; liberal vs. non-liberal; presumable Western induce change vs. Sinocentric belief; China's huge market and its irregular trade practices; opposition groups seeking leverage to reach the top; and the special non-rational cases of Japan and Taiwan.

Since the reawakening, one or another of the above issues has surfaced to bring about a crisis whether minor or serious. The more serious ones involving China have been its continued human right abuses, weapon proliferation, military confrontations, its surly

retorts when Taiwan or Japan is involved, and innumerable blatant trade violations. The US's most serious errors have been to send conflicting "signals" to China on human rights and trade issues, attempting to maintain the "status quo" in face of a rising China, ceasing all high-level contact with China after Tiananmen, the allowance and timing of Lee's visit, encouraging Taiwan's "adventurism," and upgrading its security arrangement with Japan without first consulting with China. Opportunities to bring about a sizable downward turn in their cyclical relationship abound and perhaps could set the East-West "Giants" on course for a future collision.

However, many opportunities exist to prevent hostilities by turning these sources of conflicts upon their head and making them causes of lasting peace rather than war. A new Chinese leadership may be receptive to a pragmatic US policy that acknowledges China's historical dues and ceases irresponsible attempts to "enlarge" at the CCP's expense. A practical engagement to bring about a favorable "balance of power" arrangement could be sought that satisfies China's long-standing concern over its borders while securing American national interests, such as stability in the region and further opening up of China's markets. The US could allow the inherent worth of democracy flow freely along the ever increasing avenues of communications for the Chinese people to act upon when they are ready. Finally, the US should avoid taking any unnecessary provocative actions in regard to Taiwan and Japan. Foresighted leadership and adept diplomacy would be required to achieve success. Lasting peace with an emerging relative equal is not a simple task; however, the alternative could extract a higher cost as the three scenarios reveal in the next chapter.

Notes

¹Lin, Nan, *The Struggle for Tiananmen* (Westport: Praeger, 1992), 20-25. Beijing with the “Forbidden City” is historically exempted from bloodshed between Chinese even during their many internal conflicts. The Nationalists surrounded the city to the Communists rather than fight in 1948. Only the Westerners during the “century of shame” had violated this Chinese tradition until Tiananman Square in 1989.

² Lin, 49-57.

³ Ibid. , 56, 154.

⁴ Ibid., 38-41.

⁵ Ibid., 44.

⁶ Ibid., 20-23.

⁷ Overholdt, 76.

⁸ Goldman, Merle *Sowing the Seeds of Democracy in China* (Cambridge: Havard University Press, 1994), 266-282

⁹ Lin, 41-47

¹⁰ Goldman, 320-325.

¹¹ Overholdt, 67. Many discussions among the senior Chinese leadership have occurred over instituting a more responsive one party system called “New Authoritarian.” It would provide for a strong central authority while giving more power to their equivalent of a US Congress. After Tiananmen Square, the debate was dropped for an unspecified period of time.

¹² Bernstein, 39-40. The Chinese leaders viewed the US actions of suspending all high-level contacts and granting blanket asylum to student leaders as being the leader of an international chorus of denunciation. This led many Chinese leaders to blaming Deng’s policy of opening China to Americans for this epic event in recent Chinese history.

¹³ Kissinger, 830.

¹⁴ Bernstein, 60-71. Troubled relations with the US since Tiannamen Square combined with the fall of the Soviet Union and Desert Storm convinced many senior Chinese leaders that the US was their principal enemy and would like to see China join the former Soviet Union in dissolution, according to the authors. Therefore, they recognized the need to modernize their forces quickly along the lines of the American Desert Storm model.

¹⁵ Kissinger, 719-727.

¹⁶ Shambaugh, 246-247.

¹⁷ Overholt, 73.

¹⁸ Shambaugh, 242-243.

¹⁹ Overholt, 74.

²⁰ Bernstein. 40-41.

²¹ Shambaugh, 245.

²² Institute for National Strategic Studies *Strategic Assessment 1995* (Washington DC: United States Government Printing Office, 1995), 19.

²³ Ibid., 18. The purchasing parity power (in 1992\$ billions) shows Europe first at 8,260; Asia Pacific second at 7,438; and the US third at 5,896. Original source was the 1994 World Bank Development Report.

Notes

²⁴ Ibid., 17-30. This article covers various trends in Asia Pacific with the greatest focus on China's future impact, especially in light of Japan's economic recession and lack of near-term plans to militarize. Only China plays a significant role in every major trend identified that involved key US national security issues.

²⁵ Bernstein, 67.

²⁶ Khalilzad, 202-218.

²⁷ Ibid., 211. Many of these weapon systems will be either produced in China or as a initial coproduced effort until China's industry can take over. About 300 of the SU-27s and most of the Kilo submarines will be co-produced.

²⁸ Kissinger, 810-813. This invaluable reading summarizes the impact of Woodrow Wilson's foreign policy to subsequent administrations, including the current NSS.

²⁹ Bernstein, 13-14. This is a sign of great respect and tacit acknowledgment of the CCP as the latest dynasty in China's long history.

³⁰ Kissinger, 831.

³¹ Khalilzad, 198.

³² Bernstein, 11.

³³ Christenson, 37. Interviewed Chinese security analysts were nearly unanimous in seeing the issues of Japan and Taiwan in other than "realpolitik" terms. This unanimity can trace its roots from historical events from the early 17th century until the present.

³⁴ Ibid., 38.

³⁵ Ibid., 39-40.

³⁶ Ibid., 40-45. Chinese security analysts, especially the military officers, anticipate and fear the return of Japan as a world-class military power. Any reason alternative would be acceptable.

³⁷ Ibid., 43-44.

³⁸ Ibid., 45.

Chapter 4

Three Future US/China Conflicts?

In a new era of peril and opportunity, our overriding purpose must be to expand and strengthen the world's community of market-based democracies. During the Cold War, we sought to contain a threat to survival of free institutions. Now we seek to enlarge the circle of nations that live under those free institutions, for our dream is of a day when the opinions and energies of every person in the world will be given full expression in a world of thriving democracies that cooperate with each other and live in peace.

—President Clinton, 1993

All warfare is based on deception. Hence, when able to attack, we must seem unable; when using our forces, we must seem inactive; when we are near, we must make the enemy believe that we are away; when far away, we must make him believe we are near. Hold out baits to entice the enemy. Feign disorder, and crush him. If he is taking his ease, give him no rest. If his forces are united, separate them. Attack him where he is unprepared, appear where you are not expected. These military devices, leading to victory, must not be divulged beforehand.

—Sun Tzu, 4th century B.C.

Introduction

Since World War II, the US has seen no rival capable of challenging its supremacy in the Pacific. Now the old order is being threatened by a more powerful and assertive PRC. From the Chinese viewpoint, the era of US domination should come to an end. China is ready to reclaim its historical role in Asian affairs that has spanned over two millennia. China clearly sees conflict as plausible and is preparing itself for the distant eventuality

(10+ years away). Three possible future alternatives are presented, fraught with numerous underlying causes, and ripe for the ultimate extension of politics. A conclusion with recommendations is offered to hopefully eliminate these potential futures and replace them with more peaceful US-China relations.

The first alternative future deals with the Chinese regime crushing democracy in Hong Kong. Domestic unrest and perceived western plots require the use of military intervention to save the CCP. The second is set against a Taiwanese nationalist party coming to power. It presses for open independence with a supportive US secure in its regional military strength. China sees no choice but to forcibly bring the renegade province into the fold. The last alternative future shows relations between the two countries improving until Japan begins to militarize. With the PRC's modernization effort complete and the US's military presence significantly reduced, China seeing Japan as a growing threat deems the time to strike is now.

Year 2004: Defense of the Homeland: Suppression of Hong Kong Democracy

The last seven years have shown many successes and some failures for China in its bid to reclaim its historical status. The addition of Hong Kong with its free market expertise largely intact has kept the Chinese economy, now the world's No. 1 GNP, growing at a nearly 10% rate. However, Hong Kong's usefulness to continued growth is decreasing. Additionally, the Chinese security force has uncovered alarming evidence of a Hong Kong based secret society intent on overthrowing the current regime in concert with "splittest" movements. Many factions have resented the gutting of civil liberty laws since the

takeover. Several intellectuals and business people with links to the West are involved. Though the evidence is inconclusive, it seems that US is providing covert support. Relations with the conservative US leadership are bitter with allegations of oppressive human rights violations, Chinese interference in US politics, and the recent loss of MFN status over the failure to open its markets in light of a huge trade imbalance.

China's current "technocrat" leadership, unable to achieve consensus on a firm direction to solve domestic problems, has allowed domestic turmoil to grow dangerously high. The tide of government corruption has increased to where the CCP members and their relatives own the vast majority of Chinese capital assets. The inequities between the coastal regions and the inner provinces have also increased and high unemployment for peasants looking for jobs in the cities still exist. This causes a major dip in traditional support from the peasants that is critical to any Chinese regime or dynasty (App B). Under Jiang, no progress beyond local elections has been made on political reform. Public cynicism is rising. The Chinese people, becoming receptive to alternatives, have responded with minor acts of rebellion throughout the country. Economic growth and successful implementation of local elections are the CCP's only saving grace as people continue to see gradual improvement of their lives.

A few weeks later, Jiang dies with little warning. The "hard-liners" make their move with support from the PLA for a coup d'etat. Meanwhile Hong Kong residents, feeling emboldened by the CCP's lack of a strong response while trying to sort itself out, begin a low key campaign to demand political reform. Massive demonstrations are promoted, with support from the secret society, to erupt across the country on the 15th anniversary of

the Tiananmen Square massacre. The CCP responds with a sophisticated psychological operation to sensitize the Chinese people to the dangers of Western plots to undermine proud China and recalling the days of the “century of shame.” They also begin a political reform program and anti-corruption campaign in response to the people’s request for greater equality in the use of “guanxi” (a Chinese form of nepotism).

The demonstrations, however, get out of control in Hong Kong, with rioting and armed confrontations with members of the secret society. The Chinese leadership decides to put it down with immediate military force as they were fearful of the potential for it to spread quickly and possibly lead to their overthrow. They also surmise that they have little to lose with the current US administration. Furthermore, the more rational nations, after formally condemning their actions, would likely accept the Chinese as having the sovereign right in clamping down on internal disorder to prevent its further spread as it could lead to a potential civil war.

The rioting is then suppressed; although it takes several months to reduce the threat posed by the civil unrest. Hong Kong’s democratic liberties are severely curtailed and the ring leaders jailed. The alleged US involvement that contributed to the chaotic episode is well publicized. The tainted secret society is successfully used as an example of the dangers of Western-style democracy. The Chinese people are shown evidence of the success of the political reform and anti-corruption campaigns through well-orchestrated propaganda. Jiang is painted as a weak, indecisive leader while the current leadership ensures stability and prosperity. Using business deals, the CCP takes great pains to reestablish “goodwill” with preferred nations. Relations with the US reach an “all time”

low with the CCP. They then begin to prepare for future hostilities with little common ground available or open-minded leadership in power to avert it.

Year 2008: Final Chinese Unification: The Forceful Incorporation of Taiwan

China's efforts at a peaceful unification have been frustrated by the heavy handed involvement of the US, especially its Congress, and the Taiwanese Democratic Progressive Party (DDP), formed in 1986,¹ which made significant gains after the much publicized Hong Kong crackdown in 2005. The DDP finally won a majority in the 2008 elections on its platform of independence. Its primary supporters are the native Taiwanese (the long-time inhabitants of the island), who do not believe the mainland Chinese's promises, as their own history shows them to be a tricky people.² The DDP is fully confident that any invasion attempt would be defeated and that the US will come to their aid militarily and politically, as shown during several crises since the early 90s. Numerous large-scale demonstrations in support have occurred on Taiwan. The mainland CCP, under the control of the PLA's "modern age warlords," has kept the heat on Taiwan and roused the nationalistic fervor that replaced communism as the country's unifier in the 1990s. China has been successful in keeping any major power from recognizing Taiwan through adroit diplomacy and its willingness to put on the "full court press" when needed. China has recently struck several long-term trade agreements with the European community in exchange for support on Taiwan in spite of attempts by the US to prevent it. The other Asian nations are viewed as neutral parties if a military confrontation over Taiwan occurs.

The relationship with the US declined steadily over the last decade over the usual issues of human rights, arms proliferation, sensitive technology transfer, trade imbalance related to an impenetrable Chinese market, intellectual property infringements, US interference with China's domestic affairs, conflicts over "balance of power" in the region, and China's willingness to use its economic hammer to keep other countries in line on Taiwan. The US has continued to support Taiwan by providing high-tech transfers, conducting joint military exercises, and opposing any belligerent Chinese military actions with strong "shows of force." The Chinese and Russian intelligence agencies believe Taiwan is within 3 to 5 years of being able to develop nuclear weapons based on recently gathered classified data and human intelligent sources.

The CCP realizes that it will need to act soon or face the consequences of inaction. China has been preparing for this eventuality during the past decade. A mutual defense security pact with close military sharing was signed with Russia in 1999 after NATO went forward with its expansion to the East. India has also joined forces, though in a looser sense with established military exchange programs. Since the early 90s, "sleepers" have been inserted into Taiwan to monitor and take any directed actions like engineering a "causus belli."³

China began running a series of short-noticed military exercises that brought US forces to the local area several times as the pro-Taiwan Congress put the heat on in Washington. A couple of tense confrontations occurred, including a downed Chinese fighter. A force of 30 US aircraft was sent to Taiwan after the last incident. China suddenly ceased its provocative actions prior to the Presidential elections up to Christmas.

With the US carrier battle group (CVBG) out of position for a routine fleet rotation, many US military members on vacation, and a “lame duck” president in power; China struck through its “sleepers.” Several mainland Chinese businessmen were murdered by members of the Taiwan police force who subsequently escaped. China, in righteous anger, stated the need to restore order and unite the Chinese people. China announced no intention of using any weapons of mass destruction except in self-defense; it possesses over 600 nuclear tipped missiles capable of reaching the US.⁴

Within 48 hours, China did what was thought impossible; it invaded Taiwan with a Rapid-Deployment Force of 400,000 in four waves. The CIA had stated that China was not capable of such a feat.⁵ The newly modernized Chinese Second Fleet engaged the US CVBG and some US bombers several hundred miles from Taiwan. The Chinese fleet suffered very heavy losses but the carrier group was badly mauled with the introduction of an upgraded Chinese anti-ship missile. Aircraft kill ratios were 8 to 1 in favor of the US and Taiwan. However, the Chinese could accept such losses. The invasion was successfully completed in three days with heavy losses, well before sufficient US military forces could gather to prevent the loss of Taiwan.

In the aftermath, China retains Taiwan without any further significant military actions by the US. A secret internal CIA report uncovers that the military budget for China over the past fifteen years had been underestimated by over 60%.⁶ The Chinese manage to prevent further hostilities by taking quick action to declare no further conflict was sought with the still more powerful US; now that the errant province is reunited with the mainland. It agrees to provide reparation (App B) for the damages inflicted out of their

huge foreign exchange reserve.⁷ China announces publicly that Taiwan can retain its existing government and extraordinary autonomous rights within the PRC. China also broaches the willingness to discuss regional arms controls to prevent such regrettable incidents from occurring again and preclude an arms race with its uneasy neighbors after the effective display of Chinese military power. Finally, the united China announces a sincere desire to resolve outstanding differences in trade relations with the US. With the addition of Hong Kong and Taiwan, China is now a very large economic power and a credible military power and ready to exercise its historical role in East Asia.

Year 2012: The Dragon Flies: China’s “Encirclement” Breakout

The past fifteen years have seen the gradual decline of Western power as compared to the Asian-Pacific region. The European Community could never settle the individual differences among its members. Germany still has not recovered from the incorporation of its eastern brethren. A resurgent Russian dictatorship of moderate power on par with Germany has slowly attained close ties with its neighbors. To China’s dismay, the two Koreas united in the year 1999 after the North Korean government collapsed from civil unrest related to food shortages.

The US passed the Balanced Budget Amendment after the 2000 elections. A significant portion of the discretionary cuts came from the Department of Defense while the “baby boomers” government-provided retirement system was salvaged. The US was forced to cut back on their overseas presence and reduce the size of the active duty military force by over 30% to stay within their tight budget; returning to the US’s tradition of being a “militia” state. The US Pacific forces are the largest overseas presence left.

However, they are over 25% smaller than their mid-90s size and have no troops left in Korea. Japan began to slowly militarize against the growing Chinese threat. In 2006, the US began to cooperate closely, at Japan's insistence, on a gradual upgrade and expansion of Japanese military forces. The PRC took exception as the xenophobic Chinese leadership, fearful of Japan, saw this as the first step of "containment."⁸

China growth slowed down in 1999 and has remained at about 5% since then. Chinese military modernization is now complete with over 3.5 million troops. The CCP initiated the long awaited political reforms in the year 2000 with the establishment of a "New Authoritarian" government similar to the one proposed by Deng in the mid-80s.⁹ Although, significant power is invested in its People Congress with free elections of qualified candidates. A strong authority figure is retained. This reform turns out to be very popular with its increased responsiveness and sensitivity to the people's needs while still providing for stability and maintenance of traditional Chinese law and culture. As it was being implemented, the CCP conducted a subtle psychological campaign to reinforce historical belief in China's traditions and encourages the Sinocentric view at every opportunity. The PRC also took great care in peacefully settling most of its border disputes and made strategic use of influential Overseas Chinese so that no regional alliance to counter China arose. The Spratly Islands remains a contentious issue.

Relations with the US warmed up as China was perceived as coming closer to becoming a democracy. China made significant trade concessions and improved human rights in exchange for the US pledge of non-interference with the Chinese core interests of Taiwan and governing its people. In 2005, Taiwan evaluated the regional trends and its

own best interests as US influence and support waned. It then took the calculated step of agreeing to peacefully reunite with China, as almost a semi-independent state, with generous autonomy terms. Conflicts flare up occasionally with the US; however, over the perceived shifting power balance and differing vital interests in the region. Skillful diplomatic exchanges smoothed over ruffled feathers until the next incident. Relations were fairly good until China beheld the Japanese militarizing with America's help and the Philippines, with assistance from a US company, discovered a large source of minerals near the Spratly Islands in 2008. Over the next two years, several other deposits are located by various countries and the rush was on to stake claims and mine the riches.

The Chinese leadership saw the Spratly Islands as an opportunity to decisively shift the “balance of power” in their favor before Japan became too powerful and the US reasserted itself into the region for its reawakened economic interests.¹⁰ The PRC began to extract concessions to follow its lead from the Philippines and other claimants to mine the riches alongside the Chinese. Suddenly, the South China Sea became infested with pirates on a scale much higher than the mid-90s. Some were genuine pirates. Others were secretly sponsored by the Chinese leadership.¹¹ Within the year, the PRC declared the need to provide security in the area for its people and offered to set up a regional security group run by itself. Once formed, Japanese-flagged vessels seemed to be targeted most frequently. Japan increased the pace of its military growth and sent military ships to protect its shipping in this critical area.¹²

Six months later, an incident occurred wherein a Chinese and Japanese military ships fired upon one another resulting in the sinking of the Chinese vessel. Both claimed the

other fired first. China finalized its secret preparations for war. The next few months saw additional incidents culminating with the sinking of another Chinese vessel by the Japanese. As the Year of the Dragon begins, a lucky Chinese omen, China declares a state of war exists with a partially mobilized Japan. The ill-prepared US with an undersized military fulfills its part of the mutual defense pact with Japan. Other Asian countries begin to be pulled into the quagmire. Only the ready and cocked China flew unhesitatingly into the fray; fully confident in its ability to rectify past wrongs and replace its long-time adversaries as the leader of its “new” Pacific Community.

Conclusions/Recommendations

The US, without any peers at the present, is interested in maintaining the “status quo” while China as one of the emerging peer competitors will not stand for any displays of hegemonic behavior. US national policy seeks to enhance its security, bolsters prosperity at home and around the globe, and promote democracy. China appears to be seeking reassume its historical legacy as the regional power in East Asia with the current authoritarian regime intact. The US is suspicious and mistrusts Chinese intentions. China views America as unreliable and intrusive. The past decade has seen the erosion of their once promising relationship built during the Cold War years. Preventative action is required soon to prevent increased hostility as China grows.

Some specific recommendations to slow or even reverse the erosion before flooding in the form of military hostilities begin are: 1) US policy must be guided by a clear sense of achievable American national interests based on periodic appraisals of emerging relative peers; 2) The US should pragmatically seek a favorable “balance of power” arrangement

in the East Asia region as China nears “Great Power” status rather than try to maintain its perceived “hegemony”; 3) The US must be prepared and willing to use a firm and consistent approach in dealing with China, using economic power and advance technology backed up by a strong military, to maintain a productive “engagement” that instills a sense of grudging respect and accommodation; 4) The US must be realistic and take the long-view in dealing with China as an equal based on mutual respect and recognition of their differences in core interests and cultural beliefs rather than mistrust and misperception; 5) The US must stop applying its “enlargement” of democracy to a rising non-liberal power like China and allow the inherent worth of democracy to flow naturally—it will come in their time not ours; 6) Japan and Taiwan must be treated as the special non-rational cases they represent to an emergent China—no unnecessary provocative actions.

There seem to be more areas of conflict; some almost at critical mass, than areas of common ground. Yet, China still seeks a strategic relationship with the US to balance neighbors and to assist its continued economic growth. The US desires a China that is not a threat to the region, integrated into the international system, and more amenable to liberal principles.

The key to US-China relations is tacit cooperation, especially on Asian strategy. Bouncing this off current US policy and China’s apparent strategic goal, one can quickly see an icy future ahead between these two powerful countries without foresighted leadership and adept diplomacy to prevent it. This will be the case unless China significantly reduces the scope of their seeming intent to regain their historic regional legacy or becomes a more liberal state; or if, the US stops acting as the only great and

powerful state which also possesses a morally superior ideology and instead treats the PRC as a respected and recognized relative equal along with ceasing attempts to induce changes in China. Somewhere between lay acceptable compromises, but an adversarial relationship leading to military hostilities seems a more likely scenario.

Notes

¹ Buruma, Ian, *Taiwan's New Nationalists*, Foreign Affairs Vol. 75, No 4 (Jul/Aug 96), 79. This article attempts to show that Taiwanese insistence on national sovereignty lies at the heart of their new democracy. The different perspectives of native Taiwanese and those from mainland China is captured vividly. His interviews convey the impression of growing hopes and desires to sever the final ties to the mainland when the time is right.

² Ibid., 87-88.

³ Bernstein, 191-192. The concept of "sleepers" was drawn from this source and applied in a manner consistent with the thesis of this paper and this particular future alternative.

⁴ Institute for National Strategic Studies (1995), 20. It is noted that China is actively engaged and firmly committed in modernizing its small strategic force and is unlikely to substantially increase the size of that force.

⁵ Ibid., 74. From 1988 to 1995, the size of the Rapid reaction force has grown from 15,000 to more than 200,000. The on-going modernization is expected to expand its capabilities further. These figures are based on Chong-Pin's related paper called "*Chinese Military Modernization Perceptions, Progress, and Prospects.*"

⁶ Ibid., 70-72. This portion of the book shows through a variety of sources that the official Chinese defense budget figures are vastly underestimated. China accounts for their budget quite differently from the US. Many US conventional costs are excluded, such as weapons research, nuclear weapons, military equipment and pensions. Nor is the 600,000 People's Armed Police counted though it acts as a kind of a ready reserve for international conflict. It also does not include revenue from arms sells with the money going straight back to the PLA. The proceeds earned by PLA controlled companies on the order of 20,000 companies are not included. The disparity in purchasing power parity is not folded into the official figures. Approximately 68% of the Chinese defense budget goes to covering these vastly less expensive cost categories, such as utilities, training and military support and construction. They assert the official Chinese defense budget should be multiplied by ten. They note most Western analysts have multiplied it by a factor of five (the most conservative use a factor of three). The figure of 60% seems reasonable.

⁷ Ibid., 135. As of Jul 96, China's foreign exchange reserve is \$91 billion plus \$69 billion for Hong Kong. A combined total of \$150 billion.

⁸ Christenson, 40-45.

Notes

⁹ Lin, 45-48. See expanded footnote #11 in Chapter three related to “New Authoritarian.”

¹⁰ Christenson, 44.

¹¹ Arbuckle, Tammy, *Scourge of Piracy Returns to Southeast Asia*, Air Command and Staff College Joint Operations Coursebook, 1996, 312-314. This article covers the huge increase of piracy in the South China Sea since the early 1990s. Over 60% of the entire world’s total occurred in this region in 1995. Many instances of seeming Chinese government involvement, especially military personnel, are covered in this article. It is asserted that China is using piracy to extend its authority over the Spratly Islands and the South China Sea.

¹² Bernstein, 179. Most of Japan’s energy and raw materials pass through the South China Sea. Japan is sensitive to any threats to this economic lifeline.

Appendix A

National Security Strategy's East Asian and the Pacific Regional Strategy, February 1996 (Reprinted Verbatim)

East Asia is a region of growing importance for U.S. security and prosperity; nowhere are the strands of our three-pronged strategy more intertwined nor is the need for continued U.S. engagement more evident. Now more than ever, security, open markets and democracy go hand in hand in our approach to this dynamic region. In 1993, President Clinton laid out an integrated strategy—a New Pacific Community—which links security requirements with economic realities and our concern for democracy and human rights.

In thinking about Asia, we must remember that security is the first pillar of our new Pacific community. The United States is a Pacific nation. We have fought three wars there in this century. To deter regional aggression and secure our own interests, we will maintain an active presence, and we will continue to lead. Our deep, bilateral ties with such allies as Japan, South Korea, Australia, Thailand and the Philippines, and a continued military presence will serve as the foundation for America's security role in the region. Currently, our forces number nearly 100,000 personnel in Asia. In addition to performing the general forward deployment functions outlined above, they contribute to regional stability by deterring aggression and adventurism.

As a key element of our strategic commitment to the region, we are pursuing stronger efforts to combat the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction on the Korean Peninsula. In October 1994, we reached an important Agreed Framework committing North Korea to halt and eventually eliminate, its existing, dangerous nuclear program—and an agreement with China, restricting the transfer of ballistic missiles.

Another example of our security commitment to the Asia pacific region in this decade is our effort to develop multiple new arrangements to meet multiple threats and opportunities. We have supported new regional dialogues on the full range of common security challenges. The second ARF Ministerial, held in August 1995, made the significant progress in addressing key security issues such as the Korean Peninsula and the South China Sea. It also agreed to intercessional meetings on confidence-building measures such as search and rescue cooperation and peacekeeping. Such regional arrangements can enhance regional security and understanding through improved confidence and transparency. These regional exchanges are grounded on the strong network of bilateral relationships that exist today.

The continuing tensions on the Korean Peninsula remain the principal threat to the peace and stability of the Asian region. We have worked diligently with our South Korean and Japanese allies, with the People's Republic of China and with Russia, and with the UN to resolve the problems of North Korea's nuclear program. We successfully took the initial steps to implement the U.S.-North Korea nuclear agreement, beginning with IAEA monitoring of the North Korean nuclear freeze of its plutonium reprocessing plant and of its construction of two larger plants and an expanded reprocessing facility. In March

1995, a U.S.-led effort with Japan and the Republic of Korea successfully established KEDO, which will finance and supply the light-water reactor project to North Korea. The reactor will, over a ten-year period, replace North Korea's more dangerous, plutonium producing reactors. KEDO also supplied heavy fuel oil to offset the energy from the frozen reactor projects and took measures to safely store spent nuclear fuel in North. That effort will be accompanied by a willingness to improve bilateral political and economic ties with the North, commensurate with their continued cooperation to resolve the nuclear issue and to make progress on other issues of concern, such as improved North-South Korean relations and missile proliferation. Our goal remains a non-nuclear, peacefully reunified Korean Peninsula. Our strong and active commitment to our South Korean allies and to the region is the foundation of this effort.

A stable, open, prosperous and strong China is important to the United States and to our friends and allies in the region. A stable and open China is more likely to work cooperatively with others and to contribute positively to peace in the region and to respect the rights and interests of its people. A prosperous China will provide an expanding market for American goods and services. We have a profound stake in helping to ensure that China pursues its modernization in ways that contribute to the overall security and prosperity of the Asia pacific region. To that end, we strongly promote China's participation in regional security mechanisms to reassure its neighbors and assuage its own security concerns.

In support of these objectives, we have adopted a policy of comprehensive engagement designed to integrate China into the international community as a responsible

member and to foster bilateral cooperation in areas of common interest. At the same time, we are seeking to resolve important differences in areas of concern to the United States, such as human rights, proliferation and trade. The United States continues to follow its long-standing “one China” policy; at the same time, we maintain fruitful unofficial relations with the people of Taiwan, a policy that contributes to regional security and economic dynamism. We have made clear that the resolution of issues between Taiwan and the PRC should be peaceful.

On July 11, 1995, the President normalized relations with Vietnam. This step was taken in recognition of the progress that had been made in accordance for missing Americans from the Vietnam war and to encourage continued progress by Vietnam in the accounting process. This action also served to help bring Vietnam into the community of nations. Vietnam’s strategic position in Southeast Asia makes it a pivotal player in ensuring a stable and peaceful region. In expanding dialogue with Vietnam, the United states will continue to encourage it along the path toward economic reform and democracy, with its entry into ASEAN a move along this path.

The second pillar of our engagement in Asia is our commitment to continuing and enhancing the economic prosperity that has characterized the region. Opportunities for economic progress continue to abound in Asia and underlie our strong commitment to multilateral economic cooperation, principally through APEC. Today, the 18 member states of APEC—comprising about one-third of the world’s population, including Mexico and Canada—produce \$13 trillion and export \$1.7 trillion of goods annually, about one-half of the world’s totals. U.S. exports to Asian economies reached \$150 billion in 1994,

supporting nearly 2.9 million American jobs. U.S. direct investments in Asia total over \$410.8 billion—about one-fifth of total U.S. direct foreign investments. A prosperous and open Asia Pacific is key to the economic health of the United States. Annual APEC leaders meetings are vivid testimonies to the possibilities of stimulating regional economic cooperation. As confidence in APEC's potential grows, it will pay additional dividends in enhancing political and security ties within the region.

We are also working with our major bilateral trade partners to improve trade relations. The U.S. and Japan have successfully completed 20 bilateral trade agreements in the wake of the 1993 Framework Agreement, designed to open Japan's markets more to competitive U.S. goods and reduce the U.S. trade deficit. As U.S.-China trade continues to grow significantly, we must work closely with Beijing to resolve remaining bilateral and multilateral trade problems, such as intellectual property rights and market access. In February 1995, the United States reached a bilateral agreement with China on intellectual property rights. Potentially saving U.S. companies billions of dollars in revenues lost because of piracy. China's accession to the WTO is also an important objective for the United States. The United States and other WTO members have made it clear that China must join the WTO on commercial terms.

The third pillar of our policy in building a new Pacific community is to support democratic reform in the region. The new democratic states of Asia will have our strong support as they move forward to consolidate and expand democratic reforms.

Some have argued that democracy is somehow unsuited for Asia or at least some Asian nations—that human rights are relative and that they simply mask Western cultural

imperialism. These arguments are wrong. It is not Western imperialism but the aspirations of Asian peoples themselves that explain the growing strength of democracy movements everywhere in Asia. We support those aspirations and those movements.

Each nation must find its own form of democracy, and we have respect for variety of democratic institutions that have grown in Asia. But, there is no cultural justification for torture or tyranny. Nor do we accept repression cloaked in moral relativism. Democracy and human rights are universal yearnings and universal norms, just as powerful in Asia as elsewhere. We will continue to press for improved respect for human rights in such countries as China, Vietnam and Burma.

Appendix B

Chronology of the Chinese Nation-State

Introduction

This appendix provides a synopsis of Chinese culture and a chronology of major political, cultural and warfare-related events to assist the understanding of Chinese viewpoints and actions, as it relates to the US, by providing additional insight into potential conflict trends between the US and China under the four assumptions covered in Chapter One.

Synopsis

The “Chinese civilization” is the accumulated characteristics, accomplishments and unique complexities of the people who developed over a 25-century period in the Yellow River basin and spread to the Yangzi basin. The Chinese are a comparatively heterogeneous people (over 90% Han Chinese) and encompasses over 21% of the world’s population. It has both a tradition of strong government (i.e., the “state”) and strong “culture” with few ethnic minorities population-wise. In short, the state, culture and ethnicity are strong and thoroughly intermeshed in China. The attributes of China’s culture are strong government; bureaucratic traditions; reliance on military force; introspective and preoccupied with its own affairs; and a reverence for art, nature and

education. It is the most continuous and homogenous major culture in the world despite its frontiers touching the borders of 12 East and South Asia countries and massive mountain ranges internally divide the country. This has resulted in China's preeminent national security concern with its frontiers and national stability. The development of Chinese culture from the beginning has been self-reliance with few decisive influences from abroad.¹

Chronology:

<i>Time Period</i>	<i>Concise Account Of Politics, Culture and Warfare</i>
pre-1027 BC	More than 200 small states in constant warfare.
1027-400 BC	Start of first formal Chinese dynasty, the Zhou. The longest period in Chinese history, it was characterized by violence, intrigue and shifts in geographic power; as well as philosophy and arts flourishing.
400-221 BC	A period of anarchy and open warfare known as the “Warring-States” period. Sun Tzu wrote his classic, “The Art of War” during this period. From this point onward, the eternal Chinese struggle to control the sword with the civil service and Confucianism to derogate the warrior’s role to keep the state from being at the sword’s mercy; came to fruition.
221 BC - 184	Qin (pronounced “chin”) consolidated China into an absolutist political system and the country was divided into military districts. During this period, southern China extended its borders during southward to their present position and declared themselves “Han.” The celebrated “Great Wall of China” was constructed. This wall, coupled with other geographic barriers, allowed Chinese culture to turn introspective with its own affairs. ² Territorial stability remained the primary foreign policy focus. China was a model of garrison state and empire combined.
184-222	Han emperor granted excessive powers to generals to put down an insurrection related to famine caused by disastrous flood. This proved to be a fatal mistake. The kingdom fell apart amidst quarreling and intrigue.

- 222-589 This period is called the Six Dynasties era and represented China's "Dark Age" as nomad horsemen seized the northern half of the empire. The Chinese Middle Kingdom proved to be more resilient than the Roman Empire destroyed by the Huns. The conquerors found themselves outnumbered and forced to cooperate to retain power.³ Chinese society was not fundamentally changed by the nomads. The short-lived dynasties were invested with the Mandate of Heaven within the cultural framework of dynasties and Confucian: in reality, they were military dictatorships.
- 589-877 The Sui military family laid the basis for the Tang dynasty with the unification of the country. Burgeoning economic development and peace followed, including the building of a canal linking the Yellow and Yangzi rivers and expansion to the north and west. This period was known as a Chinese "Golden Age." Even then, China controlled 25% of the world's population under a cohesive thriving central empire. During this period, warfare was again disesteemed and reduced to frontier defense or handle civil war. The scholar-bureaucrats (called "Mandarins") increased in power that had a profound impact. A competitive examination system, the basis of Chinese civil service, was open to all and based upon brains and character. They depended upon the government for their careers.⁴ The decline of this dynasty can be traced to rebellion by non-Chinese generals and a great famine. This type of internal anarchy became known as "splittist."
- 877-907 A period of great turmoil and slaughter that ultimately ruined its capital.
- 907-1279 The "Many-Dynasties" period was characterized by multiple power centers. Generally, governments were puppets of warlords who fought one another. In the midst of this anarchy, the unified Song dynasty existed from 960 to 1126. It collapsed from invasion by nomads from Manchuria. Eventually in 1279, the Mongols accomplished what no other had—the whole country was brought under foreign domination. Entire cities were annihilated and refugees flooded the countryside.
- 1279-1368 Total Mongol control of China. Their occupation made only a slight impression on the Chinese civilization. Rather, it was the Mongols who ended up adapting to the Chinese in order to collect their taxes in tranquillity. Mongol rule proved unsustainable due to rising opposition among the Chinese and disastrous floods on top of famine.

- 1368-1644 The Chinese threw out the Mongols out of Peking (Beijing) and founded the Ming dynasty. The entire country was united once more. The armies were again put out on the frontiers away from the regime. The traditional Confucian examination system was instituted and the economy was rekindled by “modernizing” fiscal policy and reclaiming cultivated land. One aberration of note occurred, extensive maritime expeditions were sent out. China even allowed Jesuits to enter China propagating Western science and education.⁵ The Portuguese established themselves at Macao. The Chinese walled them off from the interior. Japan initiated a seven year war over Korea which China won at a great cost. The Manchu tribes were able to grow strong and successfully rebel and took Peking in 1644.
- 1644-1683 A period of internal anarchy in which Manchu intrusion dominated.
- 1683-1850 Known as the Qing dynasty, it was a stable and prosperous dynasty. This was also when China’s confrontation with the West began in earnest via Europe’s commercial and cultural invasion. China was preoccupied during this time with a new enemy in the north—the Russians. They treated the trade with foreigners as a nuisance while it focused on its border concerns over territory lost to the Russians. However, it was the introduction of opium by the Europeans that had the greatest impact—social and political—on the Chinese as millions became addicted and money was made by all.⁶ When the Chinese emperor did the equivalent to the “Boston Tea Party” with opium shipments, several short wars erupted with Britain over trade issues, privileges and opium. The result of these wars was increasing British control of the export trade. Hong Kong was also ceded to Britain and five more coastal cities forcibly opened to trade.
- 1850-1898 This period saw the accelerated decline and collapse of the Qing dynasty in large part to the Europeans and Japanese. Eventually, Chinese were even banned from Shanghai which was designated as an internationally city. The effort to put down the Taiping rebellion further weakened the Chinese government who had to seek Western aid to put it down.⁷ This rebellion combined a multitude of disparate elements, including the peasants, and took over 20 million lives before being put down. In 1884, Japan took the opportunity to essentially annex Taiwan. Ten years later, they severely defeated the Chinese in war and formally annexed Taiwan.

1898-1912	China stirred itself to rebellion with the cumulative defeats with Japan, the West and Russia. The defeat to Japan lead to the loss of Taiwan was a mortal blow. The result was the Boxer rebellion, which was unsurprisingly a peasant-based part of secret societies, that focused on Christians and foreign influences. The defeat of the Boxers marked a turning point with the nation unable to control its own destiny and at the mercy of foreigners. The Qing dynasty finally collapsed of its own weight and decay while the contending Chinese forces gathered to set things right.
1912-1937	This period was the era of the Nationalists whose successor regime can be found on Taiwan today. It also marked the greatest trials to the Chinese Communist party to date. Initially, the government had little control over the regional armies who lived off the country side. In 1926, Mao Tse-tung took over the Communist field forces while the Nationalists turned on them. The Communists countered by provoking urban uprisings. The Nationalists massacred them and the war became a fight to the finish. ⁸ The communists spent many years rebuilding their strength in the countryside while the Nationalists hit their zenith. The famous “Long March” took place as Mao led the remnants of the Communist army to safety in 1934.
1937-1949	Japan formally attacked China in 1937 setting the stage for the eventual victory by the Communists over the Nationalists. The US chose to aid the Nationalists in China. Japanese occupation policies strengthened the Communists considerably as the peasants provided them strong support. The Nationalists and Communists initially concentrated on attacking the Japanese and infiltrate each other’s organization. However, they started attacking one another in early 1941 despite the continued Japanese pressure. Once the war ended, the Nationalists and Communists fought total war without compromise until there was Communist China and Nationalist Taiwan. The US tried unsuccessfully to mediate an end to the war. This was followed by the US sending almost \$2 billion among other supportive actions to the Nationalists. ⁹ Once the Nationalists fled to Taiwan, the US provided protection to them under a security guarantee.
1949-Present	Since 1949, China has gone through several phases in relating to the outside world and internally. Four distinct shifts are detectable and have been called: The “Lean to One Side” Policy; The Bandung Spirit; Resurgent Nationalism and Isolation; and Global Power Politics. ¹⁰

- 1949-1954 The first phase can be summed up as restoring their country's greatness by limiting their foreign adventures to reclaiming Tibet and supporting North Korea to protect its vulnerable modern industry in close proximity to the Korean Peninsula. Prior to this, China made overtures to normalized relations but received no answer as the US mistrusted the sincerity of China's overtures. The US also took a more protective policy toward Taiwan by signing of a mutual defense treaty and helped block China from taking the UN seat from Taiwan. Thus, the US/China animosity hardened and increased China's reliance on Russia and the cause of socialism—leaning to one side; the side of communism.¹¹
- 1954-1957 The second phase showed a gradual evolution to a more moderate policy with Stalin's death and resolution of several sources of tension with the end of the Korean war, the independence of several former colonies made imperialism seem less menacing and allowed a "non-aligned" block of nations to emerge. India and Burma became the recipients of Chinese attention based on the principle of peaceful co-existence. The situation for the "Overseas Chinese" throughout Asia also improved. These people of Chinese ancestry who live abroad are known for being clannish, having a higher income level, having control of important sectors of the local economy and sending substantial portions of their profits back to China. China tested the waters through the Taiwan Strait crises of 1954 & 1958 to probe the intention of the US. The essence of this Bandung period to spread goodwill and encourage third state countries to back Chinese policies in an atmosphere of relaxed tensions.¹² This period was too short-lived to implement many favorable policies or establish lasting institutions.
- 1957-1969 The third period began when the Chinese leadership reassessed its view of the international situation and decided that circumstances again favored revolutionary forces. China was angered when the Soviets refused to support its more aggressive stance; especially in regards to Taiwan and India. The Soviets criticized China for bombing two Taiwanese off-shore islands as well as openly sought closer ties with India during China's attempts to resolve a complicated border dispute with India. The Soviets also failed to return the lands incorporated under czarist Russia despite promises to end these unjust treaties. These and other actions culminated in an open break between the two countries and permanently rupturing communism as a monolithic entity. The Chinese proceeded alone with their "Great Leap Forward" economic development model which was hindered by removal of Soviet technicians and politically they became isolated with most

communist parties siding with Russia. The noncommunist world felt threatened by China's insistence that wars against imperialism were inevitable. China's decisive victory over India despite clear provocation by India appeared to arouse fear rather than admiration.¹³ Chinese foreign policy actions were not very successful during this period and China's isolation grew and peaked during its "Cultural Revolution" of 1966-1969. China got involved in minor but threatening to escalate border incidents with Russia. This period ended with China in near complete isolation from the world and its territory integrity appeared to be in jeopardy.¹⁴

1969 to Present

The fourth period began with the Soviets looking more threatening than the Americans to the well-being of China. Given they were both of near equal strength, China pragmatically made conciliatory moves toward the US. With Nixon's 1972 visit, relations warmed as the Taiwan issue was put in abeyance. Diplomacy moved forward and China was admitted to membership in the UN. China also mended the fences broken with past third-world supporters by apologizing and making restitution as well. China used its UN seat, while tending to vote its own interests, to advance the cause of less fortunate nations and surprised many by acting as a responsible member. Chinese foreign policy was very pragmatic but clearly against hegemony by any country. With Mao's death in 1976, China's policy became "unabashed" pragmatic resulting in significant gains for China. It was able to attract foreign investors in quantity, including Japan, and used its Muslim minority to gain wealthy Islamic states to invest. Finally, Special Administrative Regions (SARs) were set up with limited self-governing to fuel the economic development and to provide a means to absorb Taiwan in the future. During this period China invaded Vietnam to teach them a lesson for attacking their ally, Cambodia, despite heavy causalities and a set back to their modernization. China conducted a large-scale "spiritually pollution campaign" against American influence and morality when the US did not act appropriately with Taiwan, textile exports, pace of American technology transfer and handling of a defector. The Chinese warmed up to the Soviets to use it as a lever to influence the Americans. In effect, they used the enmity between the two to obtain things from each. China benefited by a gradual reduction in arms sales to Taiwan. (Post-Tiananmen) Once the thaw was achieved with the Soviets, then came the Tiananmen Square incident. The Americans among others became disillusioned by China's brutal actions against the unarmed demonstrators. The tragedy seemed to change the world's opinion

more than China's attitude towards the world as China kept an "open door to the world" policy. Staying this path resulted in a gradual thawing and some successes with Taiwan, South Korea, Brunei, Saudi Arabia and Indonesia. A major concern for China was the US being the sole superpower and in position to become a hegemony—a great Chinese fear. Unfortunately, this occurred during another strained period in by US issues with China's intellectual property violations, missile technology transfers, and human right violations. In return, China has come to view the US as bullying her by using the Taiwan card, dangling the World Trade Organization bait, and using the media to embarrass China on human rights and perhaps masterminding a plot to peacefully overthrow its socialist system (called "peaceful evolution"). Despite these open issues and sources of conflict, trade and interchanges continues to grow. The US broke the link between trade and human rights while extending MNF status in 1994. The last eight years has seen many successes with few failures in China's foreign policy. Its international actions have generally been circumspect blending careful forethought and skillful calculation of both adversary capabilities and foreign public opinion. China's traditional principles of using barbarians to control barbarians and avoiding being encircled by one's opponents is playing stronger than socialist ideology.¹⁵

Notes

¹ Morton, W. Scott, *China: Its History and Culture* (New York: Lippincott & Crowell, 1980), 2-6.

² Ibid. 5-6.

³ Fitzgerald, The Horizon History of China (New York: American Heritage Publishers Co., Inc., 1969), 54.

⁴ Ibid., 141-163.

⁵ Morton, 126-134.

⁶ Ibid., 151-152.

⁷ Ibid., 158-160.

⁸ Ibid., 186-191.

⁹ Morton, 202.

¹⁰ Dreyer, Jane T., *China's Political System* (New York: Paragon House, 1993), 397-421.

¹¹ Ibid., 398-403.

¹² Ibid., 403-405.

¹³ Paret, Peter, *Makers of Modern Strategy* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1986), 799-801

¹⁴ Dreyer, 405-411

¹⁵ Ibid., 411-424.

Appendix C

Chronology of Tiananmen Square Case Study

Introduction

This appendix provides a chronology of key events to assist understanding of the Tiananmen Square tragedy, including an individual synopsis for each of the five distinctive phases that the mass demonstrations experienced. This appendix also provides additional insight into potential conflict trends as the US implements its policy of “engagement and enlargement” to the Pacific region under the four assumptions covered in Chapter One.

Chronology^{1 2}

Period	Concise Account Of Key Events
Pre-Demonstration	This phase relates pertinent factors of the previous several months that set up the conditions awaiting only the “right spark” to initiate the sense of general contentment and desire for unspecified reforms into action. The principal sources of discontent contributing to this mass movement can be related to issues associated with the reform of the “four modernizations” (agriculture, industry, defense and science & technology). The large growth of the Chinese economy has shown its effectiveness at raising the living standards, increasing foreign investment and higher level of exports, but it was achieved at a cost to the Chinese people. ³ In 1988, inflation had risen to its highest levels at 25-35% and was out of control and the uneven distribution among the different enterprises led to a rise in sideline work (i.e., a second job). Corruption was on the rise as the traditional Chinese society reliance on interpersonal relationships and trust (called “guanxi”) was greatly abused. It is considered all right to place kin in key positions but wrong to take advantage of such a position for self-interest. ⁴ The cities were also swamped with transient population. This has lessened

the quality of life for all. Finally, the national media had exposed the population to the good life in other Asian countries, such as Hong Kong and Taiwan. The sum of all of these problems was a general sense of dissatisfaction, followed by frustration and disenchantment. The people began to question why Deng and the party couldn't get it right.⁵ In turn, the Party was itself in a state of flux as it had begun the awkward transition one generation of leadership to another (called "technocrats"). Deng was the last leader to have the mutual respect of all three key components of China—the people the government and the military. Political reform was designated as taboo during the modernization effort so as to focus on transferring the mantle of leadership and to begin the training of the next generation leaders. The former, while experiencing the normal problems and pains with transfer of power, was proceeding better than the latter. The system initiated for recruiting the next generation had to be abandoned due to immense corruption and the substitute system though more workable has proceeded much more slowly. Morale among the bureaucracy was uneven with the erosion of their authority as a consequence of unleashing the market forces. A longing for the good old days was a natural result.⁶ The culmination of these troubles of the people and the Party imparted a sense of urgency to do something yet the system seemed paralyzed. So the debates grew more intense and anxiety levels rose. Despite, this internal problems, China was forging ahead economically and on the international scene. China and Russia were making up. The ADB agreed to hold a meeting in China for the first time. The living standards were up for most everyone with substantial rewards visible. Then came the death of Hu, a popular disposed reformist, on 15 April 1989.⁷

Phase 1:

This phase lasted from Apr 16 to May 6. It was the stage setter for the subsequent transformation from a short-live student demonstration triggered by the death of a former Party secretary general protective of students and intellectuals to a mass movement lasting over seven weeks.⁸ This notable episode did not unfold in a manner not anticipated by any group. Plans were continually changed, discarded or developed seemingly on the fly throughout the ordeal. Decisions seemed to be made as part of an interaction process not fully understood by any of the parties. They seemed to be caught in a vortex not knowing how to get out intact as it had a momentum of its own until its decisive, bloody ending.

Apr 15

Hu, Former Secretary General of the CCP from 1980-1987, died. He was considered a reformist and was blamed for being too soft on student protests of 1986. He was replaced by Zhao, another reform-minded politician.

Apr 16

Students gathered to commemorate Hu's death and attacked the government and the Party at Beijing University.

Apr 17	Student demonstrations near Tiananmen Square. Submitted demands for open dialogue with authority, reassessment of Hu and freedom of the press.
Apr 22	State memorial was held for Hu while 200,000 students demonstrated outside—showed ability to organize and maintain order on a large-scale.
Apr 25	Deng received briefing on the current situation and ordered suppression of the movement, even bloodshed if necessary.
Apr 26	The official Chinese paper declared the student movement was anti-Party and anti-socialism “turmoil.”
Apr 27	Police ineffective in preventing large student march to Tiananmen Square. Encouraged by police failure, numerous bystanders gathered to watch.
Apr 30	Zhao affirmed support to opposing the demonstrating students.
May 1	Students sent an ultimatum to agree to earlier demands or face a large demonstration on May 4. The government refused student’s ultimatum.
May 4	The 22nd Annual Asian Development Bank (ADB) began for five day event with foreign press present. Seen as crucial by Chinese leaders. Students carried out a march in memory of 1921 May 4th Movement. Zhao gave speech to ADB supportive of students and peaceful resolution.
May 5	Media reporting on the student movement became more open and precise.
May 6	Students submitted petition for dialogue to Party. Media reporting becoming more open and precise, even provided live coverage. ⁹
Phase 2	This phase covers the period of May 7-19. It seemed during this period that the negotiations were headed for possible resolution as senior Party officials were even making personal contact and appeals—total victory seemed in sight for the students and the diverse following that had developed around them. The students came up with a particularly effective tactic of the “hunger strikes” and made full use of foreign media in their attempt to achieve success. The world seemed to be viewing through the foreign press a stunning movement that could bring down the hardliners and perhaps even the Party. Yet, behind the scene a powerful countermove was in progress, as the CCP strove to resolve their internal turmoil and achieve consensus, that ultimately determined the fate of this movement. ¹⁰

May 7	The students identified additional demands in political and economic reforms. Zhao indicated support for unspecified political reform.
May 9	Journalists entered the fray as the movement began to diversify by submitting a petition demanding a dialogue with the Party.
May 11	Students sent an open letter to Gorbachev to meet with them during his visit. Chinese officials stated to the press that the students would support promoting China's international image during Gorbachev's visit.
May 13	First declaration of a hunger strike by students (about 100 involved) at Tiananmen Square. It was to continue until dialogue established and student movement classified as patriotic vice "turmoil."
May 14	Citizens of Beijing began to become involved as some students fainted.
May 15	Government deadline for students to end their protest passed. Intellectuals and teachers began to march in support. Gorbachev's arrival ceremony held at airport rather than Tiananmen Square.
May 16	Gorbachev and Deng formally reconciled the rift between Russia and China. Over 100,000 marchers demonstrated, included students, teachers intellectuals, members of the press and factory workers—marked first time worker class involved. Over 1 million visit the square that day.
May 17	Zhao guaranteed no future reprisals, requested end of hunger strike and affirmed the value of the student demands. Members of state department agencies and citizen groups appeared among the marchers for the first time. Anti-Deng slogans and banners also noted for the first time. Students now demand for early termination of dictatorial rule and "old man" policies. Hunger strikes increased to 3,000. Gorbachev canceled visit to Forbidden City. More than twenty cities held demonstrations and marches.
May 18	Hardliners urged immediate resolution of the crisis and called for an emergency session for the Standing Committee. Twelve reformists declare hunger strike to be patriotic and called for an emergency session of the Standing Committee. Gorbachev left China.
May 19	Zhao urged the students to desist right away so they can "live" to see when four modernizations are realized. An urgent Central Committee meeting was conducted. Zhao did not attend the meeting. Li, the Premier, declared the presence of turmoil and noted that troops were being sent to maintain order. His announcement was relayed by television and radio repeatedly. ¹¹

Phase 3	This phase covers the period from May 20-31. This was the critical juncture as the students realized their demands would not be met. The government countermove was building up. During these 11 days, the CCP united in purpose to resolve the situation. The residents of Beijing protected and sheltered the students by offering passive resistance to entry of troops into their ancient, sacred city. Under Chinese tradition, conflict doesn't occur within its confines except by foreigners like during the Boxer Rebellion. Even the Nationalists peacefully surrendered the city to their bitter enemy, the Communists, to end the Chinese civil war. The Beijing citizens are proud of their tradition of being peaceful and neutral even during the most violent internal wars and transitions. The result was an unstable stalemate with the students divided over the best way to proceed with the CCP not ready to use arms within Beijing to end the standoff. ¹²
May 20	Martial law was declared. Unarmed troops moved towards central Beijing but was blocked by students and city residents. Hunger strikes were called off. Chinese requested foreign media to stop live broadcasts in China.
May 21	More than 1 million marched in Hong Kong in support of the students—largest in Hong Kong's history. Demonstrations held in many other cities in support for students.
May 24	Numbers of students at Tiananmen square was substantially reduced. Troops reduced influx of new students as students at Tiananmen Square began to leave in large numbers. CCP took action to have banners hoisted on all public buildings in support of the government and Party.
May 25	Government let Ambassadors from other countries know that troops are blocked because they are ordered to refrain from confrontation.
May 27	Zhao is denounced and the Party asked for support in putting down the "turmoil." Consensus behind Party's decisions started to come together with decision that the Square is to be evacuated by 30 May.
May 28	Over 1 million again marched in Hong Kong in support of students. The students decided to remain in place and not evacuate as ordered. Troops began to infiltrate Beijing in small groups, unarmed and in plain clothes.
May 30	The "Goddess of Democracy" statue was erected in the square. Beijing workers established illegal association; CCP immediately arrested its leaders. ¹³
Phase 4	This phase covers from May 31 to Jun 5. This period represents the resolution of the stalemate with decisive steps taken by the CCP in

Beijing and the other cities where demonstrations had occurred. The government took a series of escalating steps during these last few days to end the "turmoil." As each step failed to achieve the desired result, the next in line was implemented until the final bloody ending. Its peaceful components were counterdemonstrations and small groups of unarmed troops with weapons in separate vehicles to evacuate the square. When these failed, armed troops moved in slowly early morning on 4 Jun. Within 3 hours Tiananmen Square had been cleared. By midday, conflict had ceased in Beijing. By the next day, all the other cities where demonstrations had occurred were firmly under control by the government.¹⁴ It is likely that the CCP misjudged the lengths that Beijing citizens were willing to defend their tradition of peace. This great failure likely led to a much higher death toll and destruction than the leaders anticipated when they gave the final orders to use any means necessary to end it. Within China, the struggle for Tiananmen was significant well beyond the demonstrations themselves.¹⁵

- | | |
|--------|---|
| May 31 | Government-sponsored counterdemonstration was held on outskirts of Beijing. Li returned to Beijing. Government reaffirmed ban on foreign press. |
| Jun 2 | More counterdemonstrations occurred. Unarmed troops attempted to infiltrate Beijing in large numbers but were blocked by students and residents. Troops continue to infiltrate all day—most in plain clothes and unarmed. |
| Jun 3 | Troops and transports were blocked just short of Tiananmen Square. Their weapons and equipment were abandoned and captured by students. Police and troops followed with use of tear gas to disperse crowd and regained lost equipment and weapons. Throughout evening, large numbers of unarmed troops attempted to force their way to Tiananmen Square but were blocked. |
| Jun 4 | Troops used weapons and tanks forced their way to Tiananmen Square and demanded student evacuation. Square cleared within three hours of entry. No one was killed or harmed at Tiananmen Square itself. Beijing paralyzed with numerous incidents of violence. |
| Jun 5 | Beijing occupation completed. CCP reports 200 deaths, over half soldiers. Troops clashed with demonstrators in other cities until order restored. |

Post-Tiananmen Highlights

- Jun 5 to 30 US announced suspension of arms sales and official exchanges to China and offers students blanket asylum. Deng appeared on televised news as

	he congratulated military officials for putting down the revolutionary riots Mass arrest of students and workers began. Tiananmen Square reopened. Zhao officially relieved of all CCP duties for supporting the movement. ¹⁶
Feb 90	US Export-Import Bank resumed aid to China. China began to release pro-democracy demonstrators. China announced a 15% increase in military spending for the PLA.
May 90	China rejected Taiwan's offer for reconciliation as an attempt to create "two Chinas." US announced renewal of China's MFN status for one year. 881 pro-democracy demonstrators released to date.
Jul 90	China opened negotiations with Russia for purchase of military technology.
Sep 90	China reported to violate UN embargo to Iraq related to nuclear weapons. Law went into effect allowing Chinese citizens to sue government officials. ADB granted first loan since the Jun 89 crackdown.
Feb 91	Trials held for various pro-democracy movement participants. Two high Party officials removed for graft and corruption. Market opened up further to allow forces freer play.
May 91	China refused to renounce the use of military force against Taiwan. US pledged renewal of MFN to China but banned export of missile technology and equipment to China.
Jul 91	Jiang, General Secretary, viewed the country's "central political task" to be opposition to alleged Western plots against China. He blamed collapse of socialism in Russia on poor choice of successors.
Oct 91	Internal party document accused US of attempting to bring about the collapse of communism through a strategy of "peaceful evolution."
Dec 91	China announced it would export a nuclear power plant to Pakistan. US reported China is still selling missile technology to Syria and Pakistan.
Feb 92	US lifted sanctions on sale of high-technology equipment to China in exchange for Chinese agreement to restrict sale of missile technology.
Mar 92	Military spending announced to increase by 13%. Called for national campaign against liberalism renewed by official Party newspaper.
Aug 92	US sold 150 F-16 fighter planes to Taiwan.
Oct 92	Major shake up in Central Committee members occurred. China warned Britain to not push for further democracy in Hong Kong. Deng gave

	"three don'ts" speech supporting 1989 crackdown and strongly against liberalism.
Dec 92	US postponed decision on sale of computers to China on allegations that China had delivered new missile technology to Pakistan.
Apr 93	World bank announced China is now the world's fastest-growing economy, estimated at 12% per year. Over 100 top military leaders demanded an end to policy of 'tolerance, forbearance and compromise to the US.' ¹⁷
May 93	Chinese used tear gas to disperse Tibetan demonstrators. Presidential executive order issued to serve notice to Chinese leaders that they had one year to improve human rights in specific areas. Failure was threatened with removal from MFN status.
Jul 93	China accused US of fabricating evidence that China sold missile technology to Pakistan. US imposed trade sanctions on China and Pakistan.
Oct 93	China's national security leadership joined PLA senior leadership in anti-American crusade. US proposed to cancel recent trade sanction if China agrees to not sell long-range missiles to Pakistan in the future.
Dec 93	Eleven day closed door meeting among China's senior political & PLA leadership with foreign policy and military policy specialists and civilian think tank in Beijing. Detailed secret report was supposedly published showing China's long-term strategic policy toward the US. ¹⁸
Feb 94	CCP officials called from all over the country (all 29 provinces) to a meeting in Beijing.. At the meeting, the leadership designated the US as China's main global rival. The CCP's eventual aim was setting up "a global anti-hegemonic united front at an opportune moment." ¹⁹
Mar 94	Significant increase in crime within China reported by the government. US Secretary of State was subject to humiliating treatment during private meetings to press US hardline on human rights.
Apr 94	Murder of Taiwanese tourists in China set off a crisis in Taiwan-China relations. Chinese authorities arrested best known pro-democracy dissident. Chinese "trade and investment fairs" in New York and Los Angeles drew over 300 major US corporations involving deals exceeding \$11 billion.
May 94	US extended MFN to China and broke linkage between human rights and trade. However, Tibet recognized as a country by a congressional act

	bringing an official protest from China. Bilateral trade with China now at \$28 billion involving over 12,000 US companies.
Oct 94	Confrontation between a US aircraft carrier battle group and a Chinese submarine occurred in the Yellow Sea. Preparations for post-Deng era continued as his health was rumored to suffer serious deterioration.
Jan 95	China's armed naval force seized Mischief Reef from the Philippines in the Yellow Sea.
Apr 95	Newspaper "Apple Daily" is established and quickly becomes the second-most popular newspaper in Hong Kong. China has banned it for covering any officially sponsored China activity for running offensive articles. ²⁰
Jun 95	Taiwan President Lee visited the US as an invited "private citizen" via the US Congress.
Aug 95	China's foreign minister sent a chill through the annual meeting of ASEAN when he declared it was time for US to stop regarding itself "as the Savior of the East." The first delivery to PLA of SU-27s assembled in China.
Oct 95	Secretive and high-level group, chaired by Jiang Zehim, is formed. It is called the central Leading Working Group on the US Congress and is intended to enhance China's influence in American politics.
Nov 95	Jiang Zemin visited South Korea for historical first visit since CCP in power. He appealed to South Korea's animus towards Japan.
Feb 96	US/Japan signed a memorandum of understanding regarding missile defense information sharing.
Mar 96	China conducted military exercises in the Taiwan Strait just prior to the Taiwanese presidential election. The US dispatched two (rather than the standard one) carrier battle groups as a "show of force." aimed at China. It was the largest military standoff in the Pacific since World War II.
Apr 96	US/Japan declared joint security declaration. Russia signed a declaration of "a long-term strategic partnership" with China aimed at counterbalancing American power.
May 96	US federal officials uncover over 2,000 AK47 automated rifles smuggled into the country. Two Chinese officials from China's state owned arms companies were arrested. McDonnell Douglas alleged to have given China secret military technology in exchange to seek profits in China. US Secretary of Defense reported that China had attempted to obtain SS-18

	technology from Russia. This proven Russian missile is a 6,800 mile-range, multiple-warhead missile that could hit the US. ²¹
Jun 96	According to the newspaper, <i>Institutional Investor</i> , the PLA controlled over 20,000 companies which enjoy a decisive commercial advantage. ²² PLA operation in Tibet rounded up and arrested several hundred monks.
Jul 96	Chinese and American negotiators agreed to mutual visits in 1997 for each state's leader. Release of a book, <i>China Can Say No</i> , followed. It quickly became very popular in China; its theme was an angry attack on the US.
Oct 96	China reported close to acquiring the French carrier, <i>Clemenceau</i> . It was reported to include upgraded electronics and radar systems. China negotiated with Britain and Israel to buy airborne early-warning systems compatible to convert their IL-76 aircraft into AWACS.
Feb 97	Deng Xiaoping died. Jiang Lemin named to replace him during carefully orchestrated funeral ceremony. US Secretary of State empathized China's requirements towards human rights. Numerous reports that CCP provided significant money to Democratic candidates through an intermediary.

Notes

¹ Lin, 3-17.

² Sullivan, 295-305.

³ Goldman, 249-255.

⁴ Lin, 37-38.

⁵ Ibid., 38-41.

⁶ Ibid., 41-47

⁷ Lin, 49-57.

⁸ Lin, 65-67.

⁹ Ibid., 3-7.

¹⁰ Ibid., 87.

¹¹ Ibid., 7-11.

¹² Ibid., 3, 102-111.

¹³ Ibid., 11-15.

¹⁴ Ibid., 113-119.

¹⁵ Ibid., 23-25.

¹⁶ Ibid., 15-17.

¹⁷ Bernstein, 45.

¹⁸ Ibid., 46-47.

¹⁹ Ibid., 22.

²⁰ Bernstein, 3-50.

Notes

²¹ Ibid., 69.

²² Tai, Ming *Can PLA Inc. Be Tamed?* Institutional Investor, Jul 96, 41.

Glossary

ACSC	Air Command and Staff College
APEC	Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation
ARF	ASEAN Regional Forum
ASEAN	Association of East Asian Nations
AU	Air University
CCP	Communist Chinese Party
CIA	Central Intelligence Agency
GNP	Gross National Product
MNF	Most Favorable Nation
NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organization
NSS	National Security Strategy
PLA	People's Liberation Army
PRC	People's Republic of China
UN	United Nations
US	United States

guanxi. A Chinese term signifying the cultural reliance on culture reliance on interpersonal relationships and trust. It is the right to place kin in key positions but not take advantage of such a position for self-interest.

peaceful evolution. An alleged US strategy of evolving China into a democratic state through peaceful but forceful means. The intent being the overthrow of the current Chinese regime with replacement by one more friendly to America. Its origin has been generally linked to the presidency of Bush.

sinocentrism. A tendency to display the characteristics of a closely held and historic Chinese belief that China lies at the center of it all. This viewpoint circulates that they are the most important civilization on earth, the center of the universe under heaven and possessing an admirable system of government and society.

spittism. A term particular to China that indicates the tendency to internal anarchy and splitting into several states, especially during times where China is weakened or undergoing a foreign incursion. It is amplified by the usual instability of certain historic provinces, such as Tibet, Inner Mongolia, and Xinjiang.

spiritual pollution. A concept originated by the Chinese leadership to signify the corruption of morals and weakening of traditional national values by American ways.

It came into being during the late 1970s when the CCP conducted a large-scale campaign against American influence and morality. It is still in use whenever the leadership deems it appropriate to retard perceived American encroachment.

Bibliography

- Allison, Graham, *Rethinking America's Security*, New York: Norton & Company, 1992.
- Arbuckle, Tammy, *Scourge of Piracy Returns to Southeast Asia*, Air Command and Staff College Joint Operations Coursebook, 1996.
- Bernstein, Richard, *The Coming Conflict With China*, New York: Alfred Knopf, 1997. RAND in Project Air Force, Strategic Appraisal 1996.
- Blainey, Geoffrey, *The Causes of War*, New York: Free Press, 1988.
- Buruma, Ian, *Taiwan's New Nationalists*, Foreign Affairs Vol. 75, No 4 (Jul/Aug 96).
- Chaliand, Gerard, *The Art of War in World History*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994.
- Christenson, Thomas, *Chinese Realpolitik*, Foreign Affairs, Vol. 75 No 5 (Sep/Oct 96)
- Doyle, Michael, *Kant, Liberal Legacies, and Foreign Affairs, Part 2*, Philosophy and Public Affairs, Vol. 12 No 4 (Fall 1983).
- Doyle, Michael, *Rethinking America's Security: An International Liberal Community*, New York: W. W. Norton, 1992.
- Dreyer, Jane T., *China's Political System*, New York: Paragon House, 1993.
- Fitzgerald, *The Horizon History of China*, New York: American Heritage Publishers Co., Inc., 1969.
- Goldman, Merle *Sowing the Seeds of Democracy in China*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1994.
- Grinter, Lawrence, Conflict, Culture, & History: *Cultural and Historical Influences on Conflict in Sinic Asia: China, Japan, and Vietnam*, Maxwell AFB, Ala.: Air University Press, January 1993.
- Huntington, Samuel, *The Clash of Civilizations?*, Air Command and Staff College Strategic Environment Coursebook, 1996.
- Huntington, Samuel, *The West Unique, Not Universal*, Foreign Affairs, Vol. 75 No 6 (Nov/Dec 96).
- Institute for National Strategic Studies, *Strategic Assessment 1995*, Washington DC: United States Government Printing Office, 1995.
- Institute for National Strategic Studies, *Strategic Assessment 1996*, Washington DC, United States Government Printing Office, 1996.
- Khalilzad, Zalmay, *Project Air Force: Strategic Appraisal 1996*, Santa Monica: RAND.
- Kissinger, Henry, *Diplomacy*, New York: Touchstone, 1995.
- Kuchment, Anna, *Charting the Deng Revolution*, Newsweek, 3 Mar 97.
- Lin, Nan, *The Struggle for Tiananmen*, Westport: Praeger, 1992.
- Manchester, Douglas, *American Caesar*, New York: Laurel, 1983.
- Magyar, Karl, *Global Security Concerns*, Maxwell AFB, Ala.: Air University Press, 1996.
- Morton, W. Scott, *China: Its History and Culture*, New York: Lippincott & Crowell, 1980.
- Page, Susan, *US Hopes For "Continuity" With China*, USA Today, 20 Feb 97.

- Paret, Peter, *Makers of Modern Strategy*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1986.
- Ried, T.R., *Confucius Says: Go East, Young Man*, The Washington Post, 19 Nov 92.
- Saich Tony, *The Search for Civil Society and Democracy in China*, Air Command and Staff College Strategic Environment Coursebook, 1996.
- Shambaugh, David, *The United States and China: A New Cold War?*, Current History, Sep 95.
- Sullivan, Lawerence China Since Tiananmen, New York: East Gate, 1995.
- The White House, *A National Security Strategy of Engagement and Enlargement*, Washington DC, US GPO, 1996.
- Tai, Ming *Can PLA Inc. Be Tamed?* Institutional Investor, Jul 96.
- Thucydides, *History of the Peloponnesian War*, Vermont: Everyman, 1995.
- Tong Goh, *Social Values, Singapore Style*, Air Command and Staff College Strategic Environment Coursebook, 1996.

DISTRIBUTION A:

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

Air Command and Staff College
Maxwell AFB, AL 36112